

TO RECEIVE THE
LORDS SUPPER,
The Actual Right and Duty of
all Church-Members of Years not
EXCOMMUNICATE. ⁴⁷

MADE GOOD

F. 14. 7

Against Mr. COLLINS his Exceptions against *The Bar Removed*, written by the Author. And what Right the ignorant and scandalous tolerated in the Church have to the *Lords Supper* declared. Many things belonging to that Controversie more fully discussed, tending much to the peace and settlement of the Church.



AND ALSO

A full Answer to what Mr. COLLINS hath written in defence of Juridical Suspension, wherein his pretended arguments from Scripture are examined and confuted.

To which is also annexed A brief Answer to the Antidiatribie written by Mr. Saunders.

By JOHN TIMSON, a private Christian of Great Bowdon in Leicestershire.

Those members of the body which we think lesse honorable, upon those we bestow more abundant honor, ——— That there should be no Schism in the Body, 1 Cor. 12. 23, 25.

London, Printed by E. C. for Tho. Williams at the Bible in Little Britain, and Will. Tomson at Harborough in Leicestershire. 1655.



645:03

The Author to the Reader.

How weak and unable I am
for the managing of the
least truth, and how unfit
to appear in publick in its
defence, I am very sensible
and filled with fears and perplexing
thoughts in my very soul, lest I should do
any thing but for the Truth, and for the
peace of our unsetled Church; or should
be injurious to so good a cause, which I
am drawn out (I doe not well know
how) to vindicate. Who is sufficient
to defend the Truth! I tremble to think
how many precious and choyce Servants
of the Lord, and faithful Labourers in
his Vineyard, are against me in what I
publish. I reverence and esteem those
of the Presbyterian judgement above o-
thers in some considerable respects, and
verily judge them conscientious men, and
such as I look upon as best qualified, for
promoting the Gospel truth, and the
Churches peace. And although my re-
turns to Mr. *Collins* be somewhat round,

yet I hope I doe not much reflect upon most of the Presbyterian judgement, notwithstanding his seeming to write in the name of all of that perswasion. I do professe my study was to speak my very heart in this Controversie, and to provoke different mindes to give some stronger grounds for their opinion and practice; assuring my self, that a great deal more must be said against that *Free Admission to the Sacrament*, which I plead for, then any of late have said, before either Mr. *Humphrey* or my self will be answered, and many thousands in the Nation, (which I hope fear God) will be satisfied. I may safely say, with a good conscience, it is more the clear conviction of my judgement and conscience, that perswades me to appear in this controversy, then any private interest or affectation of opinion, or spirit of contradiction, or basenesse of that spirit either to humor or flatter the common multitude. I am perswaded it is the very simplicity of holy Truth which I have undertaken to defend, leading directly to the Churches Peace and Reformation. Truth seeks no
cor-

To the Reader.

corners, but is invincible, and intire in it self; it may be over-born at a push, but will recover again, and vanquish all the dark parts of man. O that we had such impartial and unbyased spirits, as to receive all truth in the love of it! Let me intreat my Reader to weigh things met with in this controversie deliberately; and then I doubt not, but of whatsoever judgement he be, he will confesse my principles and arguments are rational, and much the drift and scope of plain Scriptures: And if he will but grant me Infant Baptism, he will finde it a hard task to overthrow any of my building, as it is stated. He may see with what clearnesse and ease I have answered to what is expected against my first book, in the reading of this; and also to what is brought in defence of Suspension as distinct from Excommunication, as it is stated by Mr. *Collins*. Indeed he pleaseth himself with telling his Reader my principles are both large and rotten, but if he think to goe but an inch narrower, he will finde it a most difficult task to free himself of that charge laid against the *Pharisees*, the

making void the Commandements of God by their Traditions : He cannot go a jot narrower, but he must uncovenant, undisciple, and unduty those which he calls Church members; the doing of which plucks up all that the Church stands upon, and levels Christians not Excommunicate with the Pagan world, in point of right and actual duty of receiving. This is so irrational that it stands Mr. Collins upon to doe his utmost to give some satisfaction therein; which if he doe, he must make good from the Scriptures those things which he so often begs;

As 1. That the Lords Supper is strong meat only.

2. A seal to justifying faith only.

3 And that every unregenerate person in the Church that receives, eats judgement to himself more then in any other Ordinances of Word and Prayer, he doing in each what he can to decline and avoid profanenesse.

4. That a Church-member of years, under Toleration of the Church, is no believer or disciple under actual duty, as a Christian.

5. That

To the Reader.

5. What to the different state of the Church, as consisting of regenerate and unregenerate, is under different rules and duties, as to publick worship.

6. That more knowledge and holinesse is required to the Lords Supper, then to Baptism in persons of years.

7. He must prove Suspension distinct from Excommunication a Church censure, and for what sins.

8. That some baptized of years mentioned in the Scripture have been denyed the Sacrament of the Supper for ignorance, or for not having fruits of holinesse answerable to the Christian Profession; and yet allowed the liberty of all other Ordinances in the Church as members.

9. He must prove a Pastoral or Church tryal by examination of Church-members fitnesse or unfitnessse necessary to admitting to the Sacrament, and more such like things, before he can justly debar any from the Sacrament, more then from the rest of Church privileges and duties: If he can make good all or any of these things by the Scriptures, so as to take off what we have excepted

To the Reader.

excepted against them; then he may doe something towards giving satisfaction in this Controversie: otherwise in plain terms, I would have him to sit still, and let others (who may think to doe somewhat in order to it) put forth their strength. For I am willing my grounds and principles should be tryed to the utmost. I had rather be put to shame a thousand times, then upon mistake in any thing I should dissent from godly men, and draw any into error. But yet I would have you to know, that these grounds and principles, on which my judgement is built, have been so long received and chewed upon, and examined and tryed by general rules of Scripture and Reason, that I shall not easily be removed. For I dare boldly say, the substance of what I write, I received not from *Erastus*, Mr. *Prinne*, nor Mr. *Humphrey*; my judgement was settled and satisfied in these things long before I heard of these Authors. And besides what reason hath Mr. *Collins* to charge us with this, that we are *Erastus* his scholars, when he findes us so point blank,

blanck against him, in defending the Juridical censures of the Church? I cannot say that ever I read any Author that came up to my opinion or judgement in these things in any measure, til now of late I saw Mr. *Humphreys* Vindication of free Admission. So that whether my grounds be new or old, I have made but little enquiry in respect of humane authority: this I am satisfied in, that my grounds are such as accord with the Gospel Covenant, and the state of the Visible Church of Christ, as it is constituted in Parents and children, good and bad, called and chosen. And I finde that men of different judgements run themselves upon dangerous rocks of Schisms, Separations, and needlesse divisions in the Church; besides their interferences, contradictions of themselves, and detracting unworthily from Covenant-relation, Church-membership, Sacraments, signs, and pledges of Covenant love to the whole Church in general. And therefore I hope, though I have endeavoured to remove an unnecessary Bar, yet it will appear that I am not guilty of that sin and curse that Mr. *Collins* intimates,

To the Reader.

mates, in saying, Was it our grief formerly, that we had no Bar, and is it our work now to remove the Bars? yea, the Lords and the Churches ancient Land-marks?

But who are most faulty in this? they that plead for the Churches Land-marks and rights, or they that unjustly defraud the Church thereof, laying the Church common with the world; judge ye: or who are most for Reformation according unto Scripture Canon; they that presse to all Scripture obedience, or they that exempt Christians from some necessary duties of Worship; they that would have all in the Church dealt with as members, in a Juridical way, to their amendment; or they that unchurch them, undisciple them, and so unduty them, and level them with the Pagan World. Mr. *Collins* pretends much zeal in his Epistle prefixed to his Book; but I could wish he had more sound judgement and knowledge in these things, to abate the inconsiderate noise he makes, and the passion which he shews therein. First, he tels us that it was a burden that lay upon our souls, that in the Prelates dayes there

was

To the Reader.

was no bar but one w^{ch} ^{Estab} Suspension made.
And then about six lines after, he saith,
the Prelatical party may rise up in judge-
ment against us, and say, Lord we gave the
Minister authority to keep any from the
Sacrament for notorious sins; &c. First, he
saith, there was no Bar, and then he saith
that there was a Bar; and such a one
as I think might have satisfied men of
his perswasion. The truth is, both Pres-
byterian and Brownists make such a slender
thing of Covenant relation, the
ground of baptism in the Church, that
it will not bear up what they should
build upon it afterwards; for they make
it upon the matter but a meer titular or
nominal thing; restraining the Gospel
Covenant to believers only in a strict
sense, making Sacramental Seals invalid,
if they doe not so believe, conceiving
that if persons in the Church by their actual
offending discover themselves to be in
an unregenerate state after baptism, that
then they are out of Covenant, and so
by consequence have forfeited their actual
right to Sacramental seals thereof;
making no difference between such and
the

To the Reader.

the Pagan world. But if we hold to the Covenant made to the Church and their seed, as it was published and declared to *Abraham*, and all along to the Church of the *Jews*, and look upon the Christian Church as grafted into them, and equally children of *Abraham* by profession of faith and Baptism, as the *Jew* by nature and Circumcision, presse all to walk up to their profession as Christians according to Gospel observances, being bound to observe all things as the *Jews* were, then should we build upon such a foundation of truth that would be immoveable, and bear up as much as we now plead for. But I have exprest my self more largely in this ensuing discourse, and may not now insist upon the largeness of the Gospel Covenant. In short then I conceive, that it is a very great mistake to narrow the Gospel Covenant unto this, *He that believes shall be saved, but he that believes not shall be damned.*

I grant, 1. That this is a truth as taken in the usual sense, but then I deny that it is the whole Covenant of grace made unto the Church and their seed.

To the Reader.

2. I grant it a conditional proposition, used in the first tender of the Gospel unto Infidels, to move them to accept of Christ, and so to bring them into the visible Church; but I deny that this in like manner was, or is to be preached unto the visible Church, that profess their acceptance of Christ, and all observances appointed by him.

3. I grant that actual believing and profession of faith, was the only thing that fitted a Pagan for Baptism, and grafting into the Gospel Church, in which the promises of grace and glory belong to the whole indefinitely; but yet I deny that there is any promise of grace in those words, *He that believes shall be saved*; it is true, there is the promise of being saved upon condition of sincere believing; but there is no promise in that to give a sinner grace to believe. So that this conditional part of the Covenant in a strict sense, as it is usually urged alone without the absolute, renders unregenerate sinners, incapable of any good news by the Gospel, it not being in the power of any of himself so to believe

To the Reader.

lieve. And to make the death of Christ a seal to confirm this conditional part of the Covenant only (as being that which the Sacraments hold forth) is to make the death of Christ a seal to confirm a Covenant of works in the Church derogatory to the Gospel mercy and grace. Therefore we are to conceive of the Covenant, as it's held out to the Church by the Prophets and Apostles; the Church being built upon both. *Gen. 17. Jerem. 31. Ezek. 36.* it is largely laid down, and applied by the Apostles to the Church in Gospel times, *Act. 2. 39. Heb. 8. Act. 3. 25, 26. & 5. 31. Rom. 15. 8, 9. 2 Cor. 6. 16. 18. & 7. 1.* compared. These Scriptures prove that the Apostles did usually apply those old free grace promises, (with the end of Christ coming into the world to confirm them) to the Gospel Church. But if any please to enter their exceptions against these my notions about the Covenant, I shall be glad both of an occasion and opportunity to insist more largely upon them. For I must confesse, I think there are not many that are very right about the nature and
large-

To the Reader.

nence of the Gospel Covenant made to the Church; and that straitning the Covenant too much occasions very much division and schism in the Church. But Reader, I will detain thee no longer in the porch; only let me intreat a candid and charitable conceiving of my sense, drift and end in what I have written: I would provoke none, but leave the probability of what I have asserted from Scripture and reason, to the consideration of all. Only this let me tell thee by the way, That Suspension, as it's stated by Mr. Collins, I judge to be sufficiently confuted in the latter part of this Book. What himself or any other may doe further in stating it, and proving it by Scripture or reason deduced thence, I know not; I think whoever undertakes it, will finde it a hard task to make this good; *That some Church-members of years, and indeed with reason, shall and ought to be denyed the Communion of the Lords Supper, and yet be allowed the liberty of all other Communion in acts of worship as Church-members at that present.* And though I doe not in plain terms prove it an invention of men,

To the Reader.

yet I conceive I have so removed the arguments and reasons it's pretended to be built upon, that it doth not yet appear to be the Ordinance of Christ, and so by consequence, that it is but a Tradition of men. Jesus Christ commands all that are Disciples, Church-members, to observe all his commands, from which none that are baptized can be excluded without equal authority to that of Christ. Suspension from the Sacrament only, must first be proved an Ordinance of Christ, before any may be suspended from it. For no authority on earth can disoblige from actual duty, but the same that doth oblige to duty; I mean no authority can doe it but that of Christ, in giving the power of the keys of the Church, to binde and loose authoritatively. To conclude, let none deceive themselves in reading this Book, as if it were intended for defence of promiscuous Communion; for what I intend therein is to justify a lawful Communion in the Lords Supper according unto the rules of the Law and Gospel; and sure that is the most pure Communion that is most agreeable to
rite,

To the Reader.

rule, as the case now stands in our Church. Mixt Communion properly is to admit an Infidel, Jew, or Pagan unbaptized to the Sacrament, that denyes or knows not that Christ is come in the flesh; or to admit the Excommunicate, before they have given satisfaction to the Church by their repentance and amendment of life: If I should plead for such a Communion, then it would reflect upon me to my reproach & shame. But I plead not for this, but for Church discipline to reform the disorderly in the Church Juridically. I would have the Church still to preserve the form of all necessary duties of worship, though they cannot bring up all to the power of godlinesse, as is desirable. Better to keep up Religion, though but in the right form, then not at all. What reason can any have to discourage from any religious form of true worship, under this pretence, that they come not up to the inward power, which is undiscernable for the most part? Form and power are inseparable in the true Religion, where the Lord gives his blessing. That place of *Timothy* is usually misunderstood in our


To the Reader.

times : for it is clear they had not so much as the external form of true Christian Doctrine and Worship, but such a form of godlinesse as Heathens have or may have : for it was spoken of false teachers and seducers, that usually make pretences of a form of godlinesse of their own devising, and deny or be enemies to the form of godlinesse, which is according to truth commanded of God : for they are such as resist the truth, men of corrupt mindes, reprobate concerning the doctrine of faith. God never blesses false forms of worship with his powerful presence, working grace in them that out of strong delusion have invented those forms : but forms of his own prescribed worship, are the power of God to salvation to whom he will. Now I crave pardon of all sober men for this my so bold attempt, to clash with so many able solid Divines, as I shall be judged to do. I reverence all, and should patiently wait, and without contending submit to all ; were the Church in a settled state : but we having run into such endless divisions and separations, it concerns every one to study
and

To the Reader.

and endeavour the regaining of the settlement, peace, and edification of the whole. And I could wish that men of sober principles, who have an eye at the same end, would be more serious in weighing the grounds we build upon, and the weapons we fight with in managing this controverſie. I could wish that able and learned men would thoroughly search and more deeply dive into this controverſie; for I know that unleſſe a great deal more can be ſaid againſt Free Admiſſion as it is ſtated then I could as yet ever hear of, contrary mindes will be forced either to yeeld, or elſe they will run themſelves upon ſuch rocks as will quite break the conſtitution of our Church. But prove all things, and impartially incline to own and imbrace that which brings the full-
leſt and neareſt evidence of truth and ſolid reaſon to thy underſtanding. And the Lord give us at leaſt to ſee where the truth and the Churches peace lies, and eſtabliſh the ſame among us, which is and ſhall be the prayer of him that longs to ſee that day,

John Timſon.


The most principal things handled in this Controversie are contained in these few questions.

1. **W**Hether all Church-members of years not Excommunicate have a true right to the Lords Supper or no.

2. Whether any Church-members may lawfully be denied the Lords Supper for ignorance, and state of unregeneracy according unto Gospel rule.

3. Whether Church-members as such in relation to the Covenant, be not personally worthy during their abode in the Church, and in that sense worthy receivers, though otherwise they be actually unworthy.

4. Whether it is the duty of all Church-members of years to receive the Lords Supper, as to hear, pray, read, sing, &c.

5. Whether the promises of first grace be not included in the Gospel Covenant, which Sacraments seal: And the unregenerate

nerate in the Church be the only objects of those promises.

6. Whether the Church is to judge of her members worthinesse or unworthinesse in order to admitting to the Lords Supper more then to all other acts of publick worship.

7. Whether the Sacrament can be denyed to be a converting Ordinance in the Church.

8. Whether Juridical Suspension be an Ordinance of Christ or an invention of man.

ERRATA.

Reader among many lesser faults, which have escaped in the printing by reason of the Authors absence, there is one great fault, pag. 143. lin. 12, 13, 14. The distinction there mentioned is this, Hearing of faith preached ~~and~~ and is the ordinary means of the faith of ~~Heathens~~ but the whole work of the Ministry is the ordinary means of sincere believing in the Church. And p. 239. l. 10. after probable, supply means of instructing them in the.

PAG. 4. lin. 7. read unto. p. 13. l. 27. r. privative. p. 25. l. 6. r. reaching. p. 29. l. 8. for it. r. for it. p. 31. l. 12. r. Ozab. p. 31. l. 14. r. answer. p. 50. l. 10. r. unavoidable. p. 64. l. 15. r. examen. p. 71. l. 13. r. a knowledge. p. 89. l. 14. r. proposition. p. 98. l. 13. r. leavened. p. 99. l. 21. r. chain. p. 100. l. 27. r. visible. p. 116. l. 2. r. adjourned. pag. 138. l. 28. supply in, after doth. p. 156. l. 9. r. unelided. l. 30. supply of the whole Church, after settlement. p. 161. l. 9. r. privative. p. 166. l. 2. f. examination r. argument. p. 170. l. 2. r. irreprovable. p. 189. l. 7. supply, an ordinance of, after give. p. 199. l. 6. dele it. p. 216. l. 3. f. first r. fist. p. 249. l. 15. f. power r. prevalence. p. 275. l. 21. r. suspicion. p. 280. l. 1. f. know r. how. p. 286. l. 27. f. which r. when. p. 298. l. 32. r. to persecutions. p. 310. l. 29. r. think. p. 327. l. 8. put in profitable, after that. & l. 16. r. themselves.

To Receive the Lords Sup-
per, the actual Right and Duty
of all Church-Members of years
not Excommunicate.

Beloved Christian friends, Although
I judge that I am not as yet answer-
ed by Mr. *Collings*, (there being e-
nough in my Book to answer him
and vindicate it self from whatsoever is as yet
objected against it, to the Judicious and im-
partial Reader) yet with respect unto Mr.
Collings, who is esteemed a Gentleman learned
and worthy according unto his title, and
some profitable labours for the Churches
good. And also for the further satisfying
both of the weak and plain minded Christi-
ans: As also the confirming of those my
friends, that cordially imbrace my Book,
and adhere to the truth asserted therein: And
that the controverſie it self may come to some
clearer issue; and something more may be dis-
covered in order unto peace and truth, and
reformation in the Church of God: in all
B humi-

humility and respect unto different mindes. I crave leave once more soberly and freely to present my thoughts unto further consideration, for I judge that Mr. Collings hath been too hasty in concluding that my main principles are rotten that I have made the ground of my discourse, by what he hath said in answer thereunto: for the truth is, he hath not in the least disabled any one main thing I have asserted, nor is willing to keep to the question as it's stated, nor answer to any purpose, where the main stress of Controversie lies; but trifles about Infants, and distracted, and Pagans, and the excommunicate, the admitting of which, as such, not any in our times plead for. And therefore he might have said lesse to these, and more to those that the thing in controversy concerns: namely, *Whether the unregenerate, or ignorant and scandalous members in the Church, being baptized, and of years, not excommunicate, may be debarred the Lords Supper, they expressing their desires to receive and proffering themselves.* I answer in the negative all along, that they may not be put by. Mr. Collings seems to be offended with my charging the Reverend Doctor with unbrotherly dealing. A thing, saith he, that my self am more guilty of; which I think is hardly so, unlesse the worthinesse of the person my opinion strikes at doth so much the more aggravate the thing. As for my not taking

taking notice of Mr. *Humfreys* reflections as he calls them : it may be better excused as to my self and friend, then the other can.

1. Because that part of the Book which concerned the Doctor, was finished and gone from me towards the Presse, before ever I knew of Mr. *Humfreys* rejoinder.

2. When I did read it over, I thought his returns (to such bitter censures and invectives against him) were very patheticall, yet humble and melting, and well becoming a sober charitable Christian, and fellow-labourer with the other in the holy Gospel.

3. I have heard many godly and learned in the Ministry acknowledge that his returns are humble and charitable, and yet quick and rational. As to Mr. *Collings* quotation of the two last pages of his rejoinder ; I conceive that Mr. *Humfrey* little thought that any would be so uncharitable as to take his Allegorical reproof and caution in that unseemly sense that Mr. *Collings* will force upon it ; there being not any Scripture incapable of a rational application : And those that are impartial and sober, can judge no lesse of that. And for those six or seven dissatisfactions of mine concerning the practice of some Presbyterians unassociated, I know not how I should have expressed my self more modestly, then by professing my self unsatisfied, giving so many hints as I have clearly done against those things I charge them

with. And I am sure if the main principles in my Book stand firm, (as I think they will for any thing yet said against me) Mr. *Collings* will not be very zealous for ruling Elders, nor Suspension distinct from Excommunication, Church examination of her members into actual receiving, nor leaving out without any judicial proceedings.

But to the matter it self, let us see what he hath said against that.

First his demand is, *What it is that gives one right to the Sacrament of the Supper, he knows the answer will be Church membership; either this alone, or something else; if this alone, then Infants and mad men, and drunkards must come say what they can, if they say not Church-membership alone doth give a full right, then many of their arguments fail.*

Ans.

1. That Church membership alone gives one a legal right to the Lords Supper, according unto Gospel rules, the which right is a true right, and that sufficient unto free admission of all in the Church: but then this right is to be distinguished into a real right in point of title, and a right of actual possession and injoyment: the former right respects all Infants born of Christian Parents, the latter right belongs unto all Church-members of years, that are baptized, and in a rational and Church capacity actually to enjoy their right. An heir in his infancy hath as true a right unto his Fathers land he being

being dead, as an heir at full age: but yet it doth not follow that a childe under age shall be left actually to manage his right himself in that state, as an heir at one and twenty. We know the Apostle saith it, An heir under age differs not from a servant though he be Lord of all. Yet such is the consequence of Mr. *Collings* touching Infant Communion; if we grant them a true right as members in point of title, and a remote right actually to enjoy as soon as they are in a natural and rational capacity, then saith he, they as members must come, say what we can to the contrary. Although Mr. *Humfrey* and my self have shewed a clear difference between Infants and distracted, and the ignorant at age in several particulars.

The one 1. not in a natural capacity, as the other is.

Nor 2. in a rational capacity, as the other is.

3. The one not so under the obligation of precepts of publique actuall worship, as the other are.

4. The one not at all under the censures of the Church, as the other are: Nay although Mr. *Humfrey* in his rejoinder tels them, that there is as wide a difference between Infants and Ignorants, as between *a doe not, and a cannot*, (speaking of Examination, and discerning the Lords Body,) the Ignorant they do not, but yet they ought to do,

but Infants and distracted cannot, and are excused; yet notwithstanding all this wide-nesse in the premises, Mr. *Collings* without an answer unto ours, most peremptorily enters his consent unto the Doctors weaknesse, and tels us the Doctor saith right, that by the same reason we except against Infants, &c. we may except against the ignorant and scandalous. Thus you may see, let the premises be never so different, they must hold to their conclusion, be it never so absurd and irrational: and I would have them to take notice that,

1. We do not except against Infants and distracted, as a punishment or censure (as they) of the ignorant and scandalous: but rather we wave them as such that are under a state of weaknesse and impotency (by the wisdom and providence of God) inevitable.

2. We do not except against Infants as not having a true right, but out of the consideration of their natural and rational incapacity actually to enjoy their right.

3. We do not except against Infants and distracted, because they cannot examine themselves, discern the Lords Body, (as Mr. *Collings* would have it) But because self examination, and discerning the Lords Body, coming to receive, are not their actual duties; but we judge all these are the actual duties of ignorants, and of the scandalous in the Church, untill they be excommunicate.

And

And as soon as Infants are grown past childhood, and come under the actual obligations of precepts and worship, our principles incline us to as timely an admittance of youths, that shall voluntarily desire it, and proffer themselves, as those that oppose us. 'Tis certain that children in the Church,

1. Come under family instruction and correction before they come under the Ministerial instructions, admonitions, corrections, either of Church or State.

2. That children come sooner under negative precepts, then affirmative acts of worship; it may be a sin for that child to lye, swear, curse, steal, when at that age it is no sin to omit publick prayers, and the Lords Supper. Divines say affirmatives alwayes binde, but not to all, at all times; in many cases God will have mercy rather then sacrifice, as is supposed to the case in hand. But I could wish we might keep close to the thing in controversy. Infant Communion is not a thing controverted in our Church. In the next place in answer to his.

Church-membership tis very comprehensive, importing no lesse then Believer, Saint, Disciple, Christian, &c. and therefore needs nothing else to give a true legal right (according unto the rule) unto the Lords Supper: for all Believers, Disciples, Saints by calling and profession, when, and whilest they were within, were never denyed the

Lords Supper. It's true a Church-Member may come under divers considerations.

1. As an heir at age, or in his minority, or under distraction is still an heir, and his right to be conceived of as before.

2. So, it is in the Common-wealth, an evill and a hurtful subject is a subject, and hath the benefit of the laws thereof, as any other subjects of the same kinde, though never so good and profitable: so it is in the Church; the most uncomely members are members, and have as true a legal right to the external priviledges of the Church, as any other members of the same kinde, though never so good and holy. A difference in the degrees alters not the kinde, for that whatever belongs unto a Church-member as such, belongs unto all of the same kinde, is without doubt. We do not finde a different rule to Church-members of the same kinde; if good or bad openly offend, they ought to be proceeded against accordingly; and neither the one nor the other should be denyed an actual external priviledge of the Church, untill the Church hath given out judgement against them by excommunication authoritatively; and we are not to make any difference in the Church about members in respect of externals, the rule being only one, and the same unto all. Members, believers, disciples, brethren, in a large sense are as truly such in a true sense, as those are such indeed, in a strict sense.

Hence

Hence Mr. Collings his demand, *What it is added unto Church-membership entitles to this Sacrament?* is both frivolous and improper, because Church-membership includes as much as can be added unto it, and yet doth not exclude the worst born in the Church, and under her toleration. Nor did I ever think that any man would be so perverse (as he) to make reason and age, additions to membership, they being but essentials to the more perfect being of a man: for that is supposed of all that come under actual precepts of worship, that they are reasonable men, and of years. There is the Church-membership of Infants, and of men, and of women, yet all is but Church-membership; age, sex, and reason, &c. are not additions unto membership: but a Church-member is the same with all these: Yet it's true too, that unto all actual observances in the Church, age, and reason must necessarily be presupposed. So again, knowledge, faith, and obedience are not additions to membership, but a Church-member comprehends all these, in his sense, degree or kinde. And while they will acknowledge persons in the Church Church-members, believers, disciples, &c. they must conclude with me that Church-membership alone gives a true legal right to the holy Supper, say what they can to the contrary: so that the vanity of this superadding unto membership unto Sacramental right, is nothing

nothing else but a raising a dust to blinde our eyes. What Church either in the Old or New Testament required more then membership unto this Sacrament? all that came under Circumcision or Baptism, stood engaged to keep the Pascheover and the holy Supper. When Mr. Collings can give a clear instance otherwise, I shall think my self bound to return him thanks.

If any make enquiry what Church-membership in its rise and nature is,

Answ.

It's a relative state of persons only that have entred Covenant with God, professing either expressly or implicitly their voluntary submitting to the whole administration of the Covenant. And this entring into Covenant is either personal, or parental: Personal, of those that are Pagans born, but parental in the Church who by birth-priviledge have entred Covenant with their parents. And this I call a relative state, because it hath its priviledge meerly from the Covenant which God through Christ hath freely made unto some of mankind and their seed, whom he is pleased to own and make his people, and to be unto them a God, in a more peculiar relation, then to all others of mankind; for those whom God chooseth to approach neer unto him in his own appointments, have the promise of being satisfied with the satnesse of his house. Now then I judge, so long as Covenant relation holds,

mem-

membership holds, and so long as membership holds, the priviledges of that estate holds. It must be an authority equivalent to the ground of membership, that can dis-member, or dispossesse them of their right as members, which nothing but renouncing the Covenant, or obstinacy continued in, under the Churches censures, can doe it.

But he goes on in his mistake, and tels his Reader, *That I hold, it's only the exercise of reason conjoynd unto Church-membership gives all a right to the Sacrament, then it follows saith he, That all such who are able to exercise their reason ought to come, and be admitted. And then asks us why are drunkards excepted against*, pag. 22.

Ans.

Here is but the same again which is already answered, only he saith, why are drunkards excepted against, for they are Church-members, and can exercise reason? In stating the question Mr. *Humfrey* hath it, he might say the drunk, meaning the actual drunk, as void of reason, conscience, and devotion for that present, as being more fit to be thrust among Swine, then suffered to come unto any sacred Ordinance of Worship, in that profane sordid brutishnesse, not denying but the same man at another time when he is sober and in his serious minde to serve God as a Christian, he being not excommunicated may and ought to partake

partake of every Ordinance in the Church
a member.

Mr. Coll. Saith, If he can but shew him the least shew of Scripture to prove that a capacity to exercise a reason is that other thing which added unto Church-membership gives one an actual right, we will be his bondmen.

Ans. 1. Membership alone in its own latitude comprehends as much as he himself whay have added unto it to give a true actual right as is made out above.

And then 2. I hope *Mr. Collings* will allow men and women that are baptized and continue to adhere to the true Religion to be Church-members, and if so, himself doth grant their right, which is as much as he would have me prove; unlesse he think that Church-membership of persons grow up to years of discretion, is a meer notional thing, an empty nothing, levelling Church-members to the Pagan world, as he may well suspect him for several things he saith withall hereafter; his often urging of some thing to be added to give one of years right to the Sacrament, as knowledge, faith, and the fruits of holinesse, strongly implies that to be a Church-member, disciple, is nothing, to call give a right. It's the things he superaddes that gives the right to the Supper; whereas to all Church-membership I know, and so may he, that his superaddings are not proper, nor indeed sense; for adde those things to a Pagan, and

and they will give him right unto Sacraments,
whereas a Church-member imports the same,
they ignorant, or scandalous, during that
priviledged estate. Doth the Scriptures speak
any such additions to a Jew unto his ob-
serving the Pascheover in its season? Let it
be proved that an ignorant Jew lost his ac-
right as a Jew, or Church-member, or
that an ignorant Christian in the Apostles
wayes, that was baptized and within had no
right to the Lords Supper. Will you not al-
low as much of Church priviledge to a bap-
tized Christian now, as was allowed then? Are
the priviledges of the same Church diminished
to her members? Wherein will you have a
Church-member not excommunicate differ
from a Heathen, or the excommunicate?
You allow all other Ordinances in the
Church to a Heathen, the suspended, Excom-
municate, and just so much you allow to a
Church-member tollerated, and no more,
as now doe you confound things that differ!
What difference doe you make between the
excommunicable, and the excommunicate,
the ignorant, and such as offend out of weak-
nesse that are not excommunicate? The
Primitive and Positive suspension as you
call them, the proper and improper, &c.
the punishment *de facto* in its execution, is
all the very same, deny them the Sacrament
only, that's the least, and that's the greatest.
Whether it be done by a Classes, or Presby-
tery

tery, or a single Minister, or by the disengagement of some private Christians, or of peoples own carelesnesse. The only point of reformation and end of Discipline is that great design of keeping Church-members of years from the Sacrament, slighting their Covenant, relation, obligation and actual observances as members, disciples, lievers, &c. as if they were no more under the duties of Gospel worship then Turks & Pagans. If Church-membership with us is judged the same with those were added to the Church in the Apostles dayes; w^{ch} should we question the duty & priviledge ours, more then they of those times? I would have Mr. Collings either shew me a different state of Church-membership; or else shew me a different rule for the same Church to walk by, either let him doe the one or the other, or else be so ingenuous to yeeld every member his right, until the Church have legally dispossessed them of it.

Mr. Coll.

At the latter end of the 22 page, he drawes up the question between both, and would have it put to tryal; but indeed the question is so wide from the question in controversy, and so much said already to clear the question in hand, that I may well passe it by, and see what we can finde in page 23. where he is still upon the same thing; and pleades against me thus.

If a meer capacity to exercise reason entitled

Church-member to the Sacrament, then every Church-member in such a capacity hath an undoubted right.

I grant that every Church-member of years of discretion hath an undoubted right. *Ans.* utterly disown his antecedent, as not reckoning the question as it's stated: he should have put in this proviso, *Church-members that are professing the true religion, not under the Churches just censure.* And had he done so he might have assumed what he could, but he willing to leave so much out of his antecedent as would have spoyled his consequence, and prevented him in urging those inconsequences that follow upon it in the whole page: although I must confesse the cases he instances in, have need to be spoken unto with wisdom and tendernes; so that the truth be not prejudiced. As to the case of members that are so notoriously scandalous that of right ought to be excommunicate, but are not, as he instances in incest and adultery immediately before a Sacrament, he sees I have large principles if I would admit such a one.

1. Either such are under the suspicion of these sins; *Ans.*

Or 2. are under evident conviction. A suspicion is not sufficient to ground Church censures upon, if this be clear upon sufficient proof, the Christian Magistrate hath to doe with them, those things being punishable by death in our Law. And such malefactors

factors cannot ordinarily escape the penalty of the Law, if the Magistrate will not doe his duty. The Church may also judicially excommunicate, as suspend such. And it's a question that wiser men then I have need to answer. Whether such scandalous sinners as Mr. Collins speaks of, ought not most properly to be punished by the Judge in a Christian Common-wealth? according to the penalties, the Law of God directs in such cases? And whether the Church has to doe at all with such or no in point of censures is a question; as for other sorts of sinners that the Laws of this Common-wealth doth more indulge: the Churches cognisance in point of discipline may reach, if she be in that capacity, otherwise she can but instruct the ignorant, warn the unruly, rebuke in publick the open offender, admonish all: and have patience towards all men. Every Christian in his place to doe what in them lyes to reform themselves: and not suffer sinne to lye upon their brother. But as for that knack of excommunicable and meerly upon that account keep members back, without any tryal, whether their offendings be out of weaknesse or wilfulnesse; or without any legal proceedings in order to their amendment, is a very bold part. Such precedents are of pernicious consequence in these times, where we have none to make our appeal unto: knowing how that Brownish
hath

hath too much leavened the greatest part of the most-knowing men, Ministers, and others, in the Church of England. Well, let not any presume upon sin themselves, in pretence of punishing sin in others. If you cannot act orderly according to clear rule, make not such haste to reform as to goe about it in an unwarrantable way: as for Church-members that are in possession of their right according to law, doe not dispossesse them, untill the Church authoritatively hath given out judgement against them. Let not our Church-men be more irrational then our Lawyers for subjects in the Commonwealth.

And as for that, he saith, *Church-members not knowing whether Christ were a man or a woman.* I am sorry that any should be so grossely ignorant. I thank God I never have known any such; if Mr. Collings have, I hope not in his Parish. And I cannot but judge it a reproach of our Church and Ministry, if any such can be found amongst us. But it's a lamentable thing notwithstanding our scruples about Sacramental Communion so many years together, but few that have prepared their people ever the more by doubling their diligence in catechizing of them plainly and familiarly, in publick and private. Which I fear, some that appear forward for a purer Communion, in seven years time never did so much as in a friendly

way spend so much as an hour with their poor ignorant people in private, to inform them better, and to know their conditions, and encourage them to learn the things of God, in order to their better profiting in publick administrations. How long is it that we have been excepting against poor ignorant brethren, and yet not ordinary means used to prevent it more then heretofore; if so much: for in the Bishops times care was taken that all did learn the Lords Prayer, the Creed, and the ten Commandements; with the explanations of them, and other parts of the Churches Catechising; we had our set Prayers, that people were apt to learn; but now in many places people never hear the Lords Prayer, Creed, nor Commands, scarce in the year: nor have in use any common plain Catechism, &c. Ah, poor souls, that care is not towards them (I verily judge) as good Shepherds have of their Masters dumb sheep, who will see to every particular one that it be kept in order, and that nothing obstruct its growth and feeding; and if any sheep goe astray he diligently seeks it, and briugeth it to his fellows; and when either flye or scab doth hinder its prosperity, he will not let it alone untill the poor sheep come to him, (though he should call it) but he will goe to it, and gently catch it, (although it's so silly to flee from him) and mercifully help it: he will
not

not let them goe till they be infectious, and then separate the broken from the whole; but endeavour to keep every one in that order that all may fold together. *Take heed therefore unto your selves, and to all, over the which the holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood.* If you have that love to your Lord and Master as you should, you will feed his sheep and lambs, that they may fold together. Reverend Elders we are fallen into carelesse times, in respect of the Worship of God; little or no care is taken that our people constantly frequent the publick assemblies: ignorant persons are left to watch to themselves; you have the more cause to apply your selves to them in private even from house to house, *and be tender unto them as a nurse cherisheth her children:* to insinuate your selves in a friendly familiar way into them, will gain in them a reverent esteem of you in their hearts, which will give you the advantage of perswading them to receive instruction from you, both in publick and private: It's an easie businesse to make a separation in your flocks; and to cast off the relation of Pastor and people, and to neglect relative duties, and to fill your people with prejudices, divisions, and discontentments; and to break the peace and union of the whole: but a work of commendable difficulty; when with care, prudence, and

Act. 20.
28.

dilligence you so apply your selves unto all, as they that must give an account unto God of every particular soul committed to your charge. Remember the blood of souls; and judge your selves bound to deal with the worst of your people as members of the body of Christ, while they remain children of the Kingdom, and not reckon them dogs and Swine, untill they be legally put out of Church-Communion, and hate to be reformed by the Churches censures.

Pag. 24. Mr. Collings urgeth against my principles, thus;

He must be able to discern the Lords Body from common bread. But many men may be Church-members and rational, and yet not able to doe this, therefore something else must be added.

Answ. The Minor wants proof, and so is but a reproch to Church-members, reflecting upon our Teachers that have opportunity enough to inform the meanest capacity of years more then so. And that reverent and trembling approaching generally every where, doth prove that they judge otherwise of the consecrated signes then of common bread: why should Mr. Collings be so uncharitable to any that professe their desires, and offer themselves reverently in conscience of this service; he knowing that there is enough in the words of institution, consecration by Word and Prayer, the words used in the act of giving and receiving, sufficiently to in-

inform the meanest person that the elements are signs of the body and blood of Christ, and that they eat and drink in remembrance of Christ for remission of sins, &c. His Conclusion is false, because his Minor wants proof.

Again, *He brings in a childe of five or six years old as able to exercise reason, and so is a Church-member (if baptized) and if these two things give a plenary right, such ought to be admitted.*

Children minde childish things ordinarily and nothing else: and they come not under the obligation of worship as men of age that have put away childish things. And what if it be granted him, that they have some childish reason, doth it follow, that they have religious devotion from a principle of conscience, as men of age ordinarily expresse in most solemn sacred worship? Let him answer to what hath been said already, as to this particular, before he concludes as he doth; *That what he hath said is sufficient to shew the vanity of this conceit, as he is pleased to call it, that meer Church-membership with years of discretion gives one a full right to the Lords Supper.*

What he means by full right, he may doe well to explain himself, I have told him plainly enough, that Church-membership having its rise from Covenant relation, gives a true right unto all external Church-priviledges during that relative state of actual

Ans.

membership. I know that their real state of spiritual interest in Christ, doth put members into a higher capacity to improve their right for their spiritual advantage, then those that are but in that relative state only, of visible members in a large sense. Yet the good improvement of the one, doth not hinder nor take away the just right of the other. An ill husbands right in law is as good as the best husbands in the world, untill by law his right be taken away. And an evill member in the Common-wealth hath as much priviledge in respect of the benefit of the law while he is a member, as any other of the same kinde, though never so good. The best subject is but a subject; and the worst subject is a subject untill he be out-lawed, or convicted of treason. So I say, in the Church, the best and holiest man that lives, is but a Church-member; and the worst that lives, (he being baptized, and adhering to the true religion, and under Church indulgence) is a member also of the same visible Church, and in respect of his relative state, his right is as good to the Sacrament as the other in a legal sense, for the one is as much under observance as the other, all are Covenanters, and have entered it at least, and hence stand bound to the terms of Christian obedience. There is but one Law and rule for good and bad: the one hath received the Spirit of the Covenant, that makes his
service

service sweet and easie; the other is notwithstanding under the letter of administrations in a waiting for a blessing, and may not be released. Such have the right of precept, which is a sufficient warranty for their observance of the Supper. The other not only that, but the right of spiritual privilege and blessing through the real union and communion with Jesus Christ. And Mr. Collings his superadded qualifications to membership, or Covenanters to give a right to precepts of worship, is so flat by this time (he urging it so often) that I shal trouble my reader with it no more; only take notice, that upon the matter he makes membership a meer nothing: for doe but superadde a knowledge of the things of God, conjoyned with faith in Christ, evidenced by the fruits of holiness, unto a Turk, or any other Pagan, or Jew, in the Infidel world, it would give them the right of membership and Sacraments; and therefore at once you may see what clear conceptions Mr. Collings hath of the privileges of Church-membership.

In this page Mr. Collings conceives, *That I* Pag. 25.
have dealt more unbrotherly with the friends of Presbyterian Discipline, even some hundreds of them, both learned and reverend men, as I charge the Doctor to have done with Mr. Humfrey; and that by entring some exceptions against that discipline.
Bar removed, pag. 85, 2, 10.

I have spoke to this already, I am sorry *Ans.*
that

that such groundlesse consequences I observed from the reverend Doctor, should reflect upon some hundreds of learned reverend friends to the Presbyterian discipline. I had thought the most of the things I am unsatisfied in, as being meerly groundlesse, would not have been owned by some hundreds of such learned men. I spoke chiefly of them that are Congregationalists unassociated, and when Mr. *Collings*, or any other can clear themselves of what I charge them with, I shal either make good my charge (if you take it so) or else submit unto you, and acknowledge it my weaknesse to be unsatisfied of the truth of what I pointed at in those 8, 9, 10. pages of my Book: In the meantime Mr. *Collings* being the first that I have heard of, that hath put so hard a sense of my dissatisfactions, notwithstanding I have many Presbyterian friends, learned and reverend, it makes me something question whether many will charge it on me for unbrotherly dealing or no. I being but a private Christian might do it in order to my own and divers others satisfaction, that are in no such way, nor dare attempt any such practices, although we have made after the search of warrant for those wayes as well as other men, we not knowing how to know the minde of Christ better then by his Word in these things, nor how to know the simplicity of truth, then by seeking of God by prayer and humiliation for guidance and direction

direction in our free and serious debates in the presence of the Lord, amongst our selves in order unto practice, the which we of great *Bowden* have carefully done, even a considerable number of us with our Minister, before we did communicate together in the holy Supper: And we hope the Lord was with us in the whole, we are fully satisfied, and not ashamed to publish unto others of our Christian brethren, the grounds and principles we act from. Our greatest grief is, that we observe too great a carelesnesse in our people to worship God with us in this great engaging Ordinance of holy Communion in the Sacrament of the holy Supper. And this we shall further declare, that although our Minister were, and is, one of our old Non conformists, and did endeavour to draw us into another way of Communion; yet such was our answers and grounds, that he was satisfied therewith. And doth administer Sacraments freely with a settled satisfied judgment: we blesse and praise our God for it. Let others judge of us what they please; we judge that we act according to the minde of Christ, considering that present capacity we are in.

In this 26. page, he is pleased to examine my queries upon 1 Cor. 11. and that the rather it seems, because, as he sayes, *all my superstructure stands upon the foundation that I have there laid*, page 23. at latter end.

Answ.

I confesse I judge the streffe of all the controverſie hath been occasioned upon miſtake of the Apoſtles ſcope & ſenſe in that chapter, and therefore have endeavoured by ſeveral queries upon the place, with my answer to them conjoynd, pag. 14, 15, 16, 17. of my Book, to give you the ſenſe of the place. Which I hope hath, and will ſatisfie many diſtreſſed conſciences, which have been perplexed too much through ſome miſtake of our latter Divines; former ages and Churches, (as ſome of my friends have told me ſince), do much favour the ſenſe that have given of the place. And it ſeems to me, that Mr. Collings is put to a ſtand when to ſay to it, as for that great thing of apply-

ing the danger to unworthineſſe of perſons, which troubled us all, he confeſſes he ſees no great harm is like to come of it, if it be granted that the Apoſtle there doth not primarily ſpeak of perſon unworthineſſe, but actual. And again, he ſaith: 'Tis not much material to diſpute, whether the Apoſtle there ſpake of habitual unworthineſſe, or only actual. That there is a perſonal unworthineſſe himſelf muſt grant he ſaith, or elſe Turkes, and excommunicated perſons cannot be excluded.

Anſw.

Here you may ſee a very fair conſeſſion from Mr. Collings, I would we had found him as ingenuous in other things, that we might have been all of a minde, but though this place doth not prove it, he would have us conceive that ſome other places doe in or-

der to the Sacrament. *And it is a thing that I must grant, else Turks, and the excommunicate cannot be excluded. I will examine his Scriptures anon, and shall first deny that which he will force me to grant, his reason is worth nothing, or else Turks, &c. I grant that there is a personal unworthinesse in Turks and Pagans, and in the excommunicate also conditionally, but doth it therefore follow that there is a personal unworthinesse in the Church, that professe themselves a people in Covenant with God, and have the Lord for their God? Here you may observe again, how Mr. Collings is levelling Church-members with the infidel world; it's strange to me, that a Batcheler of Divinity, should not be able to make difference between a Pagan and a Christian. What, did he forget that federal holinesse that differenceth the clean from the unclean?*

¹ Cor. 7.
14.

He queries, *Whether every unregenerate man as such, be personally unworthy; he believes he is. I seeme to doubt, he saith.*

Without doubting that there is no personal unworthinesse in the unregenerate in the Church, simply considered in it self, for all such are in Covenant relation, the which relation is personal, they are a consecrate people to the Lord, and are in that sense holy (in opposition to the infidel world, that still lyes in profanenesse) those whom God hath chosen to bear his name,
and

Answ.

and are entred into Covenant with God. Let no man account common and unclean, commonizing such a called professing people with the Pagan world, &c. (as is the humor and sin of these times:) for persons unworthinesse cannot be in the Church, as long as a persons relative worthinesse remains. Indeed we may distinguish of a persons worthinesse in the Church: it is either relative meerly, or else real and relative together. The former is sufficient for the acceptance of the Church unto all Gospel Ordinances; the latter is that which has its praise of God, it being called the circumcision of the heart, &c. the other but the letter only, *Rom. 2. 20.* But Mr. Collins saith, *there is no need of disputing this.* Although I know the main cause of this controversy occasioned by this very thing. To what end is your Bar, but to exclude the unworthy? Why have you devised such strange things, as to make it strong meat, a seal to faith, a strengthening and a nourishing Ordinance, &c. contradistinct from all the rest in the Church, excluding it from being a means of conversion, which you allow to all the other Ordinances in the Church. To what end is your suspension, and hindring persons more from this than any other? To what end are your proving and trying of such that generally profess the same religion your selves preach, though

harm-

harmlesse and honest as to men, yet may not be admitted? I say to what end is all this, but that you are afraid of personal unworthinesse? And it is the only thing to be disputed: for we are all agreed about actual unworthinesse, that let a man be a godly man, yet if he sin scandalously he is to be censured it, and so of the unregenerate, if they be obstinate; our difference about actual unworthinesse, will be in what cases the Church may exercise the rod, for what sins: but he tells us, pag 27.

That every Church-member is by us to be looked upon as habitually worthy, unlesse by some actual miscarriage he declares himself actually unworthy.

Answ.

But the question is, whether Mr. Collings will grant that those in the Church; that they finde by their miscarriages to be actually unworthy, they judge to be habitually worthy; and let him tell us plainly; that they keep back no man from the Sacrament for habitual unworthinesse, if he can, and say truth, but for actual miscarriages onely. Let him plainly answer me in that, and then I may tell him more of my minde: in the mean time let me tell him, that I much fear his charity to Church-members savours of excessse, and exceeds all due bounds. Take habitual worthinesse in his own sense, as he expresses himself in the same thing thus, *Yet we believe their Church-membership is not that which*

which makes them thus worthy; but their interest in Christ, which charity obligeth them to believe, untill by some fruits they discover the contrary.

Ans.

Then it will follow,

1.

That all Infants born in the Church are habitually worthy, not from their Covenant holiness that gives them the priviledge of membership, but from their interest in Christ as beleivers. Let him try if he can convince the Antipædobaptist of that.

2.

That charity which obligeth us thus to believe of all Church-members, is true, & charity obligeth no man to believe that which is false.

Then it follows, that those that are habitually worthy from their interest in Christ may fall away from that habituall worthinesse they have from their interest in Christ.

3.

This strongly implyes that they hold, that no one should be continued a member of the visible Church, but such that are habitually worthy from an interest in Christ. And thus you may see how their extremity of charity runs them into an extremity of rigor and censorious dealing with Church-members at length. Let the impartial Reader judge how true it is, that Mr. Collins hath said. *'Tis not much material to dispute whether the Apostle spake of habitual unworthinesse or actual, when all he drives at is nothing else* unto

unto his admitting to the Sacrament. If I can but undermine him in that one prop, his whole building will fall, and the controverſie come to ſome good iſſue, for what Mr. Collings can doe in it, let him doe the beſt he can.

In the next place he ſaith, he dares not deny but the diſorderly eating in the Church of Corinth, was an unworthy eating; and might be a cauſe of their puniſhment, verſ. 30. We know God is very tender of his own order and brings that inſtance of Uzziah's caſe, &c.

This I take to be a good confeſſion to my *Anſw.*
 anſwer of the 3. & 4. query, pag. 16, 17, 18. The Bar removed: But I ſee he is very unwilling to come off clearly in it; mark, he doth but ſay, their unworthy eating might be a cauſe of their puniſhment. The holy Apoſtle ſaith plainly, for this cauſe many are weak and ſick, ſome dead. That is, the cauſe is plain, verſ. 29. their eating and drinking unworthily, which he further explains to be their not diſcerning the Lords body, but uſed the bare elements as common bread, not diſcerning the body and bloud of the Lord they were conſecrated to repreſent, with other particular miſcarriages in the time of adminiſtration, for this cauſe, ſaith our Apoſtle, they were puniſhed; this were a cauſe, ſaith our Author, but not all the cauſe, for which they were puniſhed with death. Who ſhall carry the ſenſe now of theſe two competitors, our Apoſtle, or Mr.

Their not diſcerning was more out of careleſneſſe and profaneſſe then ſimply out of ignorance.

Mr. Collings. I need not again urge what have formerly spoke to this Scripture, Mr. Collings or any other first answer what I have done in clearing the sense of the place, and let them prove that were for personal unworthinesse if they can, or for any other sins that they were guilty of before they met together for the time of administration, &c. Let them give us some clear demonstrations of it, if they can; if they cannot, let them be so ingenuious as to give us their consent, and trouble feeble consciences no longer with such kind trifling uncertainties that here follow our Author.

Mr. Collings hath given us three arguments to shew us why he cannot digest the sense that I have given of the 1 Cor. 11. 20. to the end.

1. He saith, because the Apostle, chap. 5. bade them of Corinth, that they could not keep feast with the o'd leaven of malice and wickedness. And bidden them purge out the old leaven, vers 7. And not eat with one called a brother who should be a fornicator, or idolater, &c. And again chap. 10. 21. had told them they could not drink of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup devils. What then, why did he not make his conclusion, that we might have clearly understood to what end he quotes those Scriptures as a reason?

But let us a little follow him in the Scrip

Scriptures, and examine what they will make to prove these two things :

1. That the Lord punished the *Corinthians* for personal unworthinesse.

2. That they were punished for some other sins then what they were guilty of in the time of administration: which is the main thing in hand.

As for 1 Cor. 5. he tels us, (not the Apostle) that they could not keep the feast with malice, &c. the Apostle exhorts them to purge out the old leaven, meaning that of the incestuous person, speaking by way of an allusion to the law of the Paschever, which were to purge their houses of all leaven against that feast which continued seven days : ressemblably he would have them purge themselves of that wicked person whom they had indulged amongst them, and made the name of God to be evill spoken of, by tolerating such sins amongst them, as is not so much as named amongst the Gentiles, that one should have his fathers wife, &c. therefore deliver him to Satan, purge your selves of your former connivence and indulging such, and then saith he, let us keep the feast, but not with malice and wickednesse, &c. but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, meaning that he would have them spend their whole lives so ; the Apostle tels them what he would have them doe, and how they should keep the feast, Mr. Collins tels us, he

D

told

told them they could not keep the feast, &c. but he that hath but half an eye may easily discern what this place is for his purpose; This proves that scandalous persons should be cast out of all Christian Communion, for the conclusion of the whole is in the last verse, *cast out from amongst your selves that wicked person*, which is the thing that I all along contend for, the just censures of the Church; but I would have none debarred their right till then.

But Mr. Collings might have given us some probable grounds to prove that the feast mentioned, was the holy Supper, and not to leave us to such uncertainties; for if it be not meant of the holy Supper, what is this to his purpose? Let him shew us where the Supper of the Lord is called a feast, and that this feast must needs be that, but this is but a shift to hold up the old interest. So hard a thing it is to come off from the authority of men, especially, when themselves are engaged in such wayes that men have framed. But then he goes on vers. 11. *And not eat with one called a Brother, who should be a fornicator, an Idolater, &c.*

Ans.
This
Scripture
is more
fully o-
pened
hereafter,
as also the
1 Cor. 10.
21.

Mr. Collings should have cleared unto us what is meant by *not eat*, whether, not eat, in a civil friendly necessary sense, or not eat, at the holy Supper with such during their actual abode in the Church. If he mean the latter, in reference to the Sacrament, I shall demand

mand of him where that word eat alone is to be taken for the holy Supper; and if it be not meant of the holy Supper, what is this to the thing in hand? The 9, 10. verses doe give us some light of the Apostles meaning, *He had wrote an Epistle to them, not to keep company with the fornicators of the world.* But in this Epistle he mollifies the former with some liberty, *else they must goe out of the world:* his meaning is, not to keep company in a civil friendly sense unnecessarily; but if a brother be such a one, keep no civil friendly company with him at all, no not to eat, upon unnecessary occasion. And so for that 10. chap. 21. *They could not drink of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup Devils too.* The main fin the Apostle aims at in this chapter is Idolatry, vers. 14. These *Corinthians* being grafted into the Christian Church, did bear up themselves upon their Church priviledges too high. And hence grew fearlessse of Gods judgements, notwithstanding their manifold sins, as that of Idolatry in this chapter, the Apostle tels them, that the Church of the *Jews* was invested with the like priviledges as they are, and yet for their provoking sins God was not well pleased with them, but destroyed many of them for their murmurings, whoredomes, Idolatries, &c. and therefore warns them of the like in general. And then in the 14. verse he applies himself unto them in particular, *Wherefore my beloved bre-*

thens fly from Idolatry, I speak to wise men, judge what I say, for this is the thing that comes near you, which some of you are guilty of. And that he might thoroughly convince them of the hainous nature of this sin, he draws an argument from the nature of that holy Communion they had together in the holy Supper, which supposes them to be all of one Christian body, for they all eat of one bread and drink of one cup, &c. Hence he would have them see what an inconsistent thing it were for them to be of this Christian body, and of another Heathenish body too; in point of Communion they could not be of both, of Christ, and Belial, this were a mixture unsufferable, to drink the cup of the Lord at one time in the Church of Christ; and then at another time to drink the cup of Devils, in his Temple, *Will you thus provoke the Lord, &c.* you must either forbear the one or the other, for you cannot serve God and the Devil. And this he aggravates the more, because it was such an offence and scandal to the weak amongst them, the which they that were the strongest Christians offended in, as the latter end of the chapter doth clearly give it, and that about indifferent things, and it became thus sinful in regard of some evil circumstances. But now what is this to prove, that this sin was in their eating and drinking unworthily in the 11. chap. as Mr. Collins would have it? for here you may conceive, that at
most

most the offenders were but implicitly threatened with punishment: but in the 11.ch. they were already punished when this Epistle was sent unto them, the which will trouble Mr. C. to reconcile. Besides had the Apostle in ch. 11. meant their actual offending in the 5.& 10.ch, then he would have said, for these causes some are punished, or for this and divers other, but as he meant no other, so he writes, and terminates the only cause of their punishment, was their profaning the holy Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, as hath been spoken to, *For this cause, &c.*

His second reason to prove he cannot digest the sense I have given, is, *because it seems very absurd to him, that a man who should but offend in a point of order, should be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, and so of judgement; and he who comes raking with the guilt of scandalous sins, should not at all be guilty or lyable to Gods judgements.*

Answ.

Why will Mr. Collins thus mince their sin? Was their being drunk, and their using a sacred Ordinance of Christ appointed for so spiritual an end, but as a civil or common Supper, but offending in a point of order? if this did not strike at the very essence and nature of the Ordinance, I know not what doth; doth not the Apostle tell them plainly, *This is not to eat the Lords Supper, but their own,* this profanation of the instituted signs rendered them guilty of polluting the very body and blood of Christ, that the signs did represent, and will he say, this were but to

offend in a point of order? I might adde their offending in point of order to the main. But then to the latter part, Touching them that come in scandalous sins, that they should not at all be guilty or lyable to the judgements of God.

Answ.

Who ever said such a word? Doth it follow, because the *Corinthians* were punished for no other cause but their prophaning this Ordinance; that therefore I must needs hold that they that come in other scandalous sins, are not lyable to any of Gods judgements for their other sins? I say, tribulation, anguish, and woe, to every soul that doth evill. And yet I say too, it's possible a scandalous sinner may come to the Sacrament, and not at all be guilty of the *Corinthians* sinning, nor as to his receiving be lyable to the judgements of God; provided he come as prepared, and carry himself as reverently at the administration as he can: for his scandalous life doth not disingage him from Christian observance while he is within, and not under the just censures of the Church to reform him thereby.

I know for carnal wretched impenitent sinners, to come carelessly, and customarily, is a great sin, and for them that out of carelesse-ness, and want of affection to it shall neglect it when they are invited to it, is a great sin also, and both punishable by the Lord. I wish all due and lawful means were used for the reforming of both, so
might

might we expect a greater blessing of grace upon all in a holy use of Gods own appointments: in the mean time let us all reform what we regularly can, and mourn for what we are wanting in.

Mr. Collings third reason is, *because he cannot conceive that God should be so unlike himself, as to look upon one legally unclean, unworthy to eat the Passeeover under the Old Testament; and yet look upon one morally unclean as worthy under the New?*

It is too bold to call the blessed God unto mans bar: because he is not like to men that are not able to reach the reason of his declared will. God cannot be unlike himself be sure; but it's possible Mr. Collings may be unlike the truth in what he saith, pag. 28. how doth he know that God lookt upon one that was legally unclean as unworthy to eat the Passeeover. We know that that uncleanness was incident to good men as well as others;? It will set him hard to prove, (I think) that it took away the habitual worthiness of a godly man, or that relative worthiness of membership, if not, such were not lookt upon as unworthy of the Passeeover, but were under a contingent necessity by the will of God that they could not observe it, but they should make the sacrifice unclean: for by the will of God it was declared unto them, that whatsoever they touched in their uncleanness should be un-

Answ.

clean. And we know it was a case the Lord indulged equally with those that were in a necessary journey, appointing them another day of purpose the next month; nor were they so much denyed the benefit of this Ordinance, as of others, that they lost the profit of during their uncleanness, there being not the like provision appointed as to the Passover.

Again, let me ask Mr. Collins, why the whole Church were to observe the Passover upon their lives; and yet he cannot deny, but in that Church in their best estate, there were many that were morally unclean, in his sense; and what doe my principles plead for more in the Christian Church; if I plead but for the same now, that upon their lives was enjoined then, even by the Lord himself. I hope he will not charge it upon me, that I make God unlike himself; but if he will make the New Testament so contrary to the Old, as to say the whole Church may not observe the Lords Supper, his opinion will hardly be reconciled with the unchangeableness of the faithful, true and living Lord God.

Thus I have given you to understand, that the legally unclean were not lookt upon as unworthy to eat the Passover at all. And the sense that I have given upon 1 Cor. 11. pleads no otherwise in favour of the morally unclean (as he calls them) then the Old Testament

ment doth injoyn. One hint more: let Mr. Collins prove that the legally unclean were expressly forbid the Passeeover. I am sure Moses knew of no expresse prohibition and therefore was at a stand when the case was brought before him, and could not tell what to direct, whether the unclean might keep it, or forbear, untill he had enquired of the Lord what they should doe; Besides when the Passeeover was rejourned to the last day, multitudes did eat it, that were not cleansed, and were accepted of: And the Lord said, *If any man of your posterity shall be unclean by reason of a dead body, or be in a journey a far off, yet he shall keep the Passeeover unto the Lord*, 2 Chron. 30. 15, 17, 18, 19, 20. Numb. 9. 10. here you see is an expresse command for the unclean man to keep the Passeeover. He kept the same Passeeover at Gods appointed season, as well as the rest of the Congregation, for God appointing and sanctifying another season for them in special made, the service the same in it self, and to them. And yet for all this, what adoe have our late Divines made about this? I could wish we might hear no more of it, unlesse they can make better use of it then Mr. Collins doth. Now I have answered three arguments that made him so hard of digesting this truth, That the Corinthians were not punished for personal unworthinesse, but for their actual offendings at the time of administration. For the further help

helps of this hard digestion and jedification and satisfaction of my Christian friends, I freely speak my heart for the clearing up of this in question, according to my measure for I know well enough, that our mistake about worthinesse and unworthinesse of person in the Church hath done more hurt to this Church then all the Bishops ever did.

1.

Our holy Apostle in 1 Cor. 7. 14. has clearly and fully exprest himself about habitual worthinesse, that if but one of marriage state were a believer, the other infidel person was sanctified by the believing party and tels us that if it were not so, their children they had between them were unclean but now are holy: meaning, that upon the faith, and entering into the Covenant of the one, their children enter covenant with the parent, and upon that account are a holy seed and federate with their parents in the privileges of the Church, as it was in the state of the Jews Church. Why surely if the branches were holy, then the root was holy also. Now I say, how can it be imagined, that the Apostle will have the children holy even of those persons that in chap. 11. be judged personally unworthy? Sure if the children were federally holy, then their parents were too, for the right of the child is derived from the believing state of the parents; & that was sufficient to free them from unworthy eating in respect of their persons.

And

And therefore the Apostle concludes that all things are sanctified to the Church by the Word and Prayer. *To the pure all things are pure, but to the unbelieving and impure is nothing pure.* Here is a clear difference between the professing Church and the infidel world: all is clean to the one, but nothing clean to the other. And therefore the Sacrament could not be polluted by the believing *Corinths*, in respect of their persons. It will follow then that it was profaned by their evil actions only. The Apostle understood the nature of the Gospel Church better than those I have to deal with in this controversie. He understood the right rule, and accordingly reduced all unto it. He distinguisheth between clean and unclean, believer and infidel: all was clean to the one, and nothing clean to the other, that except the *Corinths* had admitted Infidels unto the body and bloud of Christ to pollute it, personal unworthinesse could not be the sin for which they were punished; Heathenish uncleannesse the uncircumcised might not eat thereof.

I tell you this is that which hath undone us of late, we make the same difference in the Church, that the Apostle made between the Church and the world. And all those Scriptures on which this difference is declared by the Apostle, our Divines usually apply to the different state of persons in the Church, the regenerate and unregenerate; and accordingly

dingly would be dividing their people, and are as fearful (many of them) to admit an unsound believer to the Sacrament as a uncircumcised Infidel, but I hope those exorbitant distempers that some desperately plunge themselves into from the same mistakes, will make sober men consider last.

I know no such language used in Scripture concerning persons of the Church, as that any Church-members should be personally unworthy to use Gods Ordinance, and to serve God in his own appointments. Indeed for persons to reject the tenders and invitations of the Gospel, to oppose and persecute the messengers that publish life and salvation by Jesus Christ; such are said to be unworthy of eternal life, *Act. 13. 46.* the Apostle Paul again tells the unbelieving Jews, *That it was necessary that the Word of God should have first been spoken unto you; but seeing by envy, contradiction, and blaspheming, vers. 45. you put it from you, and judge your selves unworthy of eternal life, loe, we turn to the Gentiles, for so hath the Lord commanded.* So our blessed Saviour, *Matth. 10. 11, 12, 13, 14.* gave the twelve Commission to Preach, that the Kingdome of Heaven is at hand, &c. they were rather to goe to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, then to the Samaritans. And when they came either into City, Town, or Family, they were to salute it, and preach peace unto them,

them, but if they were not worthy, their peace should return; and to those that would not receive them and hear their words, they were to shake off the dust of their feet against them, vers. 14. with a grievous judgement threatned, vers. 15. against such people that refuse the Gospel when it is tendered unto them. These are said not to be worthy, that reject the Gospel wholly as the unbelieving *Jews* did; which implies those that receive the Gospel and believe the truth thereof, and professe their subjection unto it, being of no other religion then what the Gospel teacheth, they may be said to be worthy, whatever they are for sincerity and truth: so again *Matth. 22.* concerning the invited guests to the marriage Supper, (which set forth the fat things of the Gospel administrations, and the grace thereof,) the messengers were sent to call in the guests, that were bidden, but they made light of it, and would not come, and some went to their farms, and others to their merchandize, and others abused the servants that invited them, &c. Then the King was wroth and destroyed those murderers, and said to his servants, The wedding is ready; but they that were invited were not worthy, vers. 8. This was meant of the unbelieving *Jews* that totally rejected Christ, and would never come under his external administrations set up in his Church, in order to salvation: they are said (you may

may see) not to be worthy, or unworthy but the *Gentiles* that came in, though some came absurdly, and perished too, at last, yet there is no such thing said of them, no they were worthy, though they consisted of good and bad. The invitation privileged all to come, there is no pleading I am unworthy to come, but refusal was that which the unworthiness consisted in only. From the hints of Scriptures we may conceive there is no such thing as personal unworthiness in order to observance and duty of persons in Covenant relation, which all are that have entered Covenant, though but in the parents, untill they renounce the Covenant or for their hating to be reformed by the Churches just censures they be discovenanted conditionally, that if they never repent and return to their obedience in a right way, they are gone forever; Now then I say, if the Scriptures charge not any with unworthiness of person, but such as I have instanced in, who can imagin that the Church of *Corinth* was punished for that?

3. I would gladly know of Mr. *Collings*, or any other learned man, where the Scriptures threaten punishment against personal unworthiness simply? Or where can they give an instance that ever any were punished for habitual unworthiness at all, in the Old or New Testament? If you cannot finde such a thing in all the whole Bible, what reason

reason can you have to judge that the *Corinthians* were punished for personal unworthinesse? It's true, the sin of our natures derived from the first man is punished with death: for we all dye in *Adam*, but this natural death is a common lot appointed for all, good and bad, It's appointed for all men once to dye, *Heb. 9. 27.* And we see death reigns over Infants that have not sinned after the similitude of *Adams* transgression. *Rom. 5.* but in this both original sin, and death that follows thereupon, is of unavoidable necessity by the decree of God. So likewise as actual sin is the transgression of the law, he that so transgresseth is lyable to the punishment of that law. And the whole Law *1 Tim. 1.* it self is made for the lawlesse and disobedient, for *9. 10.* the ungodly and for sinners, for murderers, for whoremongers, for lyars, and for perjured persons, &c. that is, for the punishment of all wilful disobedience of men. And so it is said of the Church, *If you will walk contrary to me, I will walk contrary to you.* You have I know of all the families of the earth, yet the Lord will punish them for their sins. And wherefore doth living man complain for the punishment of his sin? *Lam. 3. 39.* all the punishments threatned in the Word, and inflicted either by God or man, were for actual offendings: but we never read of any coming to the Ordinances that were punished for a meer want of regeneration, circumcision of the heart, an interest in Christ, &c.

This

This is a case the Lord hath alwayes pitye
 and promised the cure of unto his Church
 forasmuch as no man can convert and rene
 his own soul, of himself; nay of those
 that have the means, and use the ordinar
 means of their salvation, as the Jews did
 It's said, *not of him that willeth, nor of him
 that runneth, but it is God that sheweth mercy,* Rom
 9. Habitual unworthinesse in that respe
 is unavoidable; and is the common state
 all by nature, as well them that are born
 the Church as those that are born out of
 Ephes. 2. but the Covenants of promise
 made to the Church for the cure of this
 praved state. And the Lord hath set up
 Ordinances of Word, Sacraments, and Pray
 in the Church, as the ordinary means
 men to use in their conversion and salvatio
 revealed in the promises of the Covenant
 the neglect whereof is usually punish
 with blindenesse, and profanenesse, not
 diligent frequenting of them. But what
 God doth punish habitual or natural un
 worthinesse (it being an effect of *Adams de
 section*) What is that to the Church that
 bounded by a rule? May they contrary
 all rule judge of it, and punish it therefore
 with suspension from the Sacrament? Our
 blessed Saviour rebukes this rash humour
 men, saying, *Judge not, lest you be judged.*
 It's clear enough, that we may judge of
 mens actions, and finding them transgres
 sions,

sors, we may punish their persons; but we have nothing to do to judge of mens persons, let them be good, or bad, as to their persons, that is nothing to us, we must leave them to stand or fall to their own Master, for what have we to doe to judge another mans servant. But if either be found transgressors so far as their offendings come within the Churches cognisance to punish, let them impartially doe it without respect of persons in the Church. We read that those that are appointed to judge amongst their brethren, are to judge Deut. 1, 16, 17. righteously between every man and his brother, without respect of persons in judgement; to hear the small as well as the great; not fearing the face of any man, for the judgement is the Lords, and the cause that is too hard for man to judge of, was to be brought before the Lord, and he would hear it, there is a rule given to judge of causes and actions between brother and brother. And yet in point of causes and things external, that brethren might differ in, these might be too hard for men to judge of. How much more hard is it to judge of the spirits of men within them, whether they have an interest in Christ or no? surely if in the other, much more in this we are to refer it to the Lord; besides, you may see in judging about things which concerns the Church, *Matth. 18.*

1. It must be of evill actions only.

2. Upon sufficient proof.

E

3. And

3. And in case of obstinacy, refusing to hear the Church, &c. before any judgement can issue out against them. Tell me how you can apply this rule to personal unworthinesse? Can this be attested upon Oath? Is the Church able to convince any in particular of it? Or is it in the power of any to reform it? Hence I conclude, that this is not applyable unto the rules of Church discipline: so it is such an avoidable thing for Church-members, that not any man of reason will plead the punishing of, with suspension from the Lords Supper.

4. If the Apostles meaning 1 Cor. 11. were that the *Corinthians* were punished for habing unworthinesse, and that whosoever eats and drinks that is personally unworthy is guilty of the body and bloud of the Lord, and eating his own damnation, then these several inconveniences and snares must necessarily follow.

1. That there is not any Minister on earth can administer the Sacrament clearly in faith because he cannot have a clear ground of faith for him to believe that those he delivers the Sacrament unto, are habitually worthy from their interest in Christ; so that they must still lye under the bondage of fear and doubt of his communicating with others, the murder of Christ, and eating and drinking their own damnation.

2. That all weak doubting fearful Christians (either

(either Ministers or others) that are not groundedly assured of their interest in Christ for acceptance in this service, cannot come in faith, *for he that doubts is damned if he eat; and what ever is not of faith is sin.* Such persons that are not upon good ground assured of the truth of their own worthinesse, cannot be assured of their eating and drinking worthily, but must of necessity lye under the fear of being guilty of what is threatned; and so eat doubtingly, (if such venture to come,) which is sin, or else they must forbear until they be assured, or are fully perswaded of the truth of their own personal worthinesse. And this would be the perplexity of most sincere Christians, there being but few in comparison of those, that arrive to any grounded assurance of their own justification, sanctification, salvation, &c. Hence we may conceive, that when Mr. Collins calls the Sacrament strong meat, he means because there is not any but strong Christians that can partake thereof with satisfaction, peace and comfort. And so upon the matter he denyes it to be milk for babes, as well as a means of working grace in those that want it.

That all blinde self-conceited Pharisees, and senseless secure carnal Christians, formal confident hypocrites, that never were acquainted with any saving work of grace upon their spirits may come to the Sacrament boldly, for they doubt not of their good

estate before God, and hence they shall be,

1. Either flattered in their grosse presumption by the Churches admittance of them.

Or 2. They must be bard out by such ban as the Scriptures no where make.

4. That hence Ministers of the Gospel are forc'd to detract unworthily from Christs authority in his commanding this observance to the whole Church, disswading their people from this service due to Christ more then from any other whatsoever, and so will presume to loose where Christ binds; or else are forced to suspend them illegally, and so presume to bind where *Christ* doth loose, & leave at liberty freely to serve him in his own appointments.

5. What a snare doth this kinde of unworthy eating bring upon all the unregenerate, and doubting Christians! If they neglect the Sacrament for want of personal worthiness they sin in omitting so great a duty of public worship; if they observe it as well as they can, yet being unworthy, they eat and drink their own damnation, by being guilty of the bloud of Christ, as some say.

6. What doth more occasion godly and tender consciences to withdraw Communion from our Parochial congregations, & gather Churches out of a Church, then fear of personal unworthy eating and drinking in Sacramental Communion? as for the external actions in the present administration, the deportments of all generally are such as are inoffensive,

five,

five, and they doe not separate from us, for the most part, out of any other dislike of publique Worship.

That hence it is that we make the nature of Sacraments to clash with themselves, in that we will not suffer them to meet in the same subjects, and are afraid to administer the seal to those parents, whose children we freely administer it unto: but the refusal of the one followed home, will soon destroy the administration to the other, for in all Scripture Churches, they always meet together in one and the same subject. When Mr. *Collins* hath chewed well of these several things, I hope he will finde in himself a better digesting of that which I have given of the Apostles sense.

And therefore in the next place I shall come to touch a little further of actual unworthinesse in reference to the Sacrament, having clearly removed that miserable mistake of personal unworthinesse in order to unworthy receiving. And indeed the whole controversie will be brought to actual sinning; for that is the very thing the Church of *Corinth* was blamed and punished for.

Then the dispute will lye in these few questions.

Whether any unworthy actions of persons in the Church, makes them guilty of unworthy receiving more then of unworthy Communion in other special parts of publick worship, or no:

2. Whether the Church be able to judge in particular, what persons in the Church upon tryal, or otherwise, will of necessity be guilty of the body and bloud of Christ, and ex judgement to themselves in the Apostles sense.

3. Whether the Church hath power to suspend Church-members from Sacramental Communion, allowing them the priviledges of all the other Ordinances.

I shall answer in the negative unto the (under favour) to Mr. Collins, or any other that shall endeavour to give further satisfactions to the questions. And to the first I have hinted at already in answer to Mr. Collins quotations, 1 Cor. 5. chap. 10. all that hath said from those Scriptures, doth not amount to eating and drinking unworthily that was punished, chap. 11. I have also in my Book shewed at large, what eating and drinking unworthily it was, that was punished and which made guilty of the body and bloud of Christ; in short, I conceive it were an open abuse, or a Sacrilegious profaning holy things to common use, with other disorders in the very time of the administering the Lords Supper, practically destroying the very essence, and spiritual ends of Christs holy institution. And upon this account alone they were guilty of the body and bloud of Christ, and of eating judgement to themselves: not for any other cause or sins they

lay under; but for this cause some are dead,
&c. And whosoever they are that eat and
drink the outward signes, set apart by the
Word and Prayer to represent the body and
bloud of Christ unworthily, as the *Corinthe-
ans* did, are guilty of the same sin, and
lyable to the same judgements, but that all
other sinful actions committed before they
come, though not repented of, doth make
guilty of polluting the body and bloud of
Christ, and of judgement, they demeaning
themselves reverently, and conformly, as to
the externals thereof: is to me not only
doubtful, but irrational and absurd. And
untill some better grounds be produced for
the satisfaction hereof, then Mr. *Collins* hath
given, I am not like to be answered in this
very thing. And let me tell Mr. *Collins*, and
all that are friends to his judgement, that
they must make out that very thing by holy
Scriptures, or else themselves will be forced
to yeeld the cause, and not so much as threa-
ten their poor people any more with the
murder of Christ, and eating and drinking
their own damnation: for as to that which
is visible, which man is to judge of in the act
of publick administration, what fault can
any of you finde? I could wish that in all
other publick Worship, all persons would
carry themselves as reverently, and be as seri-
ous and intent in their attendance upon di-
vine appointment. It's a strange thing to

me, that although you cannot charge upon your people the profanation of the holy Supper in that way that the *Corinths* were punished for; yet you fright them with the same danger, and are more severe in barring them from it, then ever we read of by any Apostles or Elders in Scriptures. In all other duties of publick worship, you presse your people to be frequent in; and to do their homage to God as well as they can, you will tell them is better then to neglect them. And only touching this publick duty of the Sacrament, you tell them they had better to forbear. And it is a lesse sin not to come, then to come, although they come as prepared as they can. When this is a duty incumbent to all in the Church, that are baptized, and of years sufficient to come under the obligation of positive precepts, as any other is. The usual grounds you have given will never hold, because you have run your selves upon such mistakes about this main place of *1 Cor. 11.* and I verily believe I have made such exceptions against the common interpretations of latter Divines, that you will finde it a work of such difficulty to answer to satisfaction; that you will be forc'd either to deny our Church to be a true Church, or else let the controversie fall; (I mean as it consists of all baptized members in general) and act as true Scripture Churches have done both in the Old and New Testa-

Tes-
Mr.
on
scri
wit
der
leas
in
my
I ha
tho
to
ling
ture
be
mea
taki
per
of n
wor
ign
actu
of
com
selv
som
the
the
god
ple
and
out

Testament. I have seen what a deal of pains Mr. Collins hath taken to make good suspension from the Sacrament; I have weighed his scripture arguments as heedfully as I am able, with the judgement of the ancient and modern Divines, and yet I cannot discern the least solid bottome, for all that he hath said in that dispute to rest upon, or trust in, for my own satisfaction, although God knows I have not the least prejudice against any authority he hath made use of, but am willing to try all things. And I purpose God willing to examine the main grounds of Scripture he hath concluded suspension from, if I be not otherwise prevented hereafter: in the mean time I shall goe on with this undertaking in hand. I confesse were this true, that personal unworthinesse in the Church, did of necessity cause persons to eat and drink unworthily, and so bring judgment: or that the ignorant and scandalous amongst us that are actual offenders upon other accounts, must of necessity eat and drink unworthily if they come, and so bring judgement upon themselves for unworthy receiving: there were some colour for to fright men and hinder them from coming to the Sacrament: but if these things will not be sufficiently made good, the ground of all our fears and scruples, and devices is removed and taken away, and we must conclude, that so long as the outward administration is carried on with
reverence

reverence and external holinesse, and good order, suitable to the institution and rules of worship; that there is no other unworthy communion in this part of Gods public worship, then in the other parts thereof, so much, for the ignorant unregenerate Christians are more careless, and unreverent, and sluggish in hearing, praying, singing, then in the Sacrament; I cannot tell what men may say to this. I finde that Mr. Collins has said but little to it, notwithstanding my pressing it so much in my Book, he knoweth that if it be not fully answered, all that hath said in favour of suspension will fall to the ground, and his book will be worth nothing. I also shall in all humility desire Mr. Collins, or any of his judgement, to tell if they can make good the affirmative of the next question.

Quest. Whether the Church be able to judge particular, what persons upon tryal will eat and drink unworthily in the Apostles sense.

Ans. I say it's a thing that the best Elders in the Church of England cannot certainly know of any member beforehand; for so they finde one very ignorant of God, and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, and of Sacraments and all other worship; yet he being a baptized person, and professing a willingness to learn, and to serve God in his publick worship, as well as he can; Upon

what

what account can any dissuade him from it ? as I have already proved in my Book, the baptized, as well as the circumcised, come under all observance in the Church.

The which I shall have occasion to speak more fully unto hereafter, when I come to that which Mr. *Collins* hath answered to that particular. If you say, such will eat and drink unworthily in the Apostles sense. You cannot be sure of that, which was seldome or never seen in our Congregations ; and for to dissuade from a necessary duty of worship, upon such a fear before hand, that was seldome or never heard-of, is not very rational. I shall easily grant that blinde obedience and service is sinful obedience. And such lye under an unsutable frame of spirit to attempt any of the things of God that are holy and sacred. But how doth this impotency and unsutable frame disengage them from duty and homage : especially their reverential approaches unto Sacramental Communion, being such as bears a good conformity to the main materials prescribed for the carrying on the external part of that service ; and men can judge but according to the outward appearance ; so that then there being no appearance of any open abuse and profaning holy things, the Church cannot charge them with any other unworthy eating or drinking, then praying, and hearing, and singing, &c. Which not any
that

Ignorant
Church-
members
of years,
no objects
of Church
censures,
especially
when they
are wil-
ling to
learn.

that are sober doth judge a ground compe-
tent to dissuade from those duties. Besides,
ignorance is rather a meer want, that cannot
in many be helped for want of vision: or
plain instruction; the which, though it be
threatned, and punishable by the Lord: yet
comes not within the verge and cognisance
of men to punish, otherwise then it is pun-
ished in the effects of it, yea even for the
actual miscarriage of such, &c.

Say again, that some persons are known
to be scandalous in some actual offendings,
and doth not give such satisfaction of their
amendment as is required, shall the Elder-
ship tell such persons they must not come to
the Sacrament, for if they doe, they will eat
and drink their own damnation, be guilty of
the blood of Christ in the Apostles sense;
when they may be knowing persons and able
to discern the Lords body, and to carry
themselves conformly, as to the prescription
of all Sacramental actions appertaining to
that service? it doth not follow.

3. I easily grant in this case, that any sin in-
dulged in a mans self, or in the Church, may
hinder Gods blessing upon his own Ordi-
nances; *For he that regardeth iniquity in his
heart, God will not hear his prayers; and the sa-
crifice of the wicked is an abomination unto the
Lord;* but it will not hence follow, that such
must not pray, nor offer sacrifice at all; but
they ought to reform the evill as well as doe
the

the good, if they expect that God should hear them.

I grant also, that every scandalous sinner in the Church should be dealt withall according to divine rule, the neglect thereof as it respects private members, or the publick Officers either of Church or Commonwealth, doth leaven accordingly : but yet I deny that such sinners are to be debarred their necessary duties of worship, untill they be juridically proceeded against by a lawful Court of Judicature.

2.

I grant again, that every scandalous sinner in Church is lyable to the judgements of God for his sinful enormities : but yet I deny that those sinful enormities of swearing, drunkenness, uncleanness, lying, coufenge, dishonesty, &c. is eating and drinking the body and bloud of the Lord unworthily, which the *Corinthians* were punished for.

3.

I grant again, that such scandalous sinners continuing impenitent, cannot communicate in the Supper without sin, and it is unsutable and inconsistent with their Christian profession, and that which God upbraids sinners oft with in Scriptures ; but yet this doth not reach the *Corinthians* sinning at the time of the administration of the Supper : but is applyable to all other worship as well as to the Sacrament. For my part I cannot yet see one Scripture alleadged by any that doth prove, that the moral unclean in the Church

4.

Church were debarred the Passeeover, or Supper, more then the other parts of publick worship; which is a thing of necessity to be proved by those that venture to debar from the one, and yet allow them the liberty to enjoy the other. What the Doctor hath said as to that, hath been answered, and what Mr. Ward hath said, hath been answered also, and what Mr. Collins hath said, or can say as to that, I donbt not in the least but will be easily answered too. And to this purpose I shall take leave to examine some of Mr. Collins quotations, pag. 101. *Ezra 6 21. And the children of Israel which were come again out of the captivity; and all such as had separated themselves unto them, from the filthinesse of the Heathen of the land, to seek the Lord God of Israel, did eat, and kept the feast of unleavened bread seven dayes, &c.* How this proves that the morally unclean were debarred the Passeeover, I know not, he might have told us how; that all that were returned from their captivity, that were of the true Church, and all such that separated from Heathenish idolatry and mixtures to the Church did eat the Passeeover, is true, this implyes that those that would not seek the Lord God of Israel, continued in Idolatrous practices, and would not keep the Passeeover. Can Mr. Collins prove that some of the children of Israel, that returned from their captivity, was debarred the Passeeover for their moral uncleanness; or can he prove

prove hence, that they were all free from that uncleanness? doubtlesse if he take notice of what follows in the 9. 10. chap. he must acknowledge there were many guilty of moral uncleanness; and yet all kept the Passover: so that you may easily discern how pertinent this is for his purpose. The next quotation is 2 Chron. 23. 19. *And he set the porters at the gates of the house of the Lord, that none which were unclean in any thing should enter in.* From this Scripture he cryes up a suspension of some from some Ordinances that were not excommunicated, &c. but he cannot tell it seemes whether from the Passover or no, and then what is this for his purpose? I think we never read of any other uncleanness in Scripture, but Heathenish uncleanness, and legal uncleanness, that were not to enter into Gods House or Sanctuary; and as for Moral uncleanness, either it was such as was punished by the Judges according to their Judicial laws, or such as they were cleansed from externally by their continual course of Sacrifices and offerings, and hence there was no such thing at all, nor were any ever bar'd from the Passover upon any such account, that I could ever finde in the Book of God, and well might the Porters charge be, to keep out those that were unclean in any thing, because we know there were several kindes of personal uncleanness that were legal, besides the uncircum-

cised

cised Heathen that might not enter into the Sanctuary, Ezek. 44. 7, 8. nor eat of the Pasſeover, Exod. 12. And the main reason why thoſe that were but legally unclean might not eat the Pasſeover, nor come to the Tabernacle to offer his Sacrifice, as others in their ſeaſon did and were accepted; was this, becauſe the perſon that was unclean made every thing he toucht unclean too, and he that neglected his time for cleaning and concealing it, that ſoul was to be cut off from the Congregation, he hath defiled the Lords Sanctuary, Numb. 19. 13, 20. That of Hag. 2. 14. proves the ſame. But I have answered his other quotations in my examine of the Scripture rule. I need not inſiſt upon theſe any longer, for they are too triflingly urged to require any further answer. Why doth he not ſhew us ſome Scripture to prove that ſome have bin ſuſpended from the Pasſeover for moral uncleanness, and allowed the liberty of all other publick worſhip? the which is the whole ſubject of his great Book almoſt. Yet I am certain he can finde nothing for his turn in Moſes and the Prophets: And I think he hath as little from Chriſt and his Apoſtles; for the foundation of his ſuſpension from the Sacrament only; which is the queſtion I ſhould ſpeak unto next. But I ſhall let it alone unill I come in ſhort to examine the quotations alledged in the New Teſtament, to prove the affirmative by

Mr.

Mr. Collins in the main body of his last Book. I shall now go on with answering to what he saith to mine.

My fift and sixt queries are, 1. *What is the remedy the Apostile prescribes to that Church to prevent future judgement, and to enjoy present benefit.*

2. *Whether the unregenerate and most ignorant person, professing and owning the true Religion among them, were not in some capacity so to use the remedy, as to prevent the judgement, and to receive benefit by the Ordinance where God gave a blessing, pag. 13. The Bar removed.*

I doe not finde that Mr. Collins hath much to except against, what I have answered to these two queries in my Book, pag. 19, 20. He grants what I have said is true, but yet he sayes, in case of scandalous sinners in the Church, self examination is not enough, but there is something to be done by the Ministers and officers of the Church, he grants self examination a personal remedy; but there are other Church remedies, which the Apostile commandeth the use of, as well as this, 1 Cor. 5.

I am ready to yeeld it, that there are Church remedies, and judge that his quotation, 1 Cor. 5. is so, for the reforming scandalous brethren. And that those that are justly delivered up to Satan, or cast out of Christian Communion by the authority of the Church, should not only be debarred the Sacrament, but all publick Ord-

nances, and all civil society, so far as our particular callings will possibly admit of; but yet I am far from thinking, that the Apostle ever meant that delivering unto Satan, and to put from among themselves that wicked person, was no more but exclude him the Sacrament. And I verily believe, that the same censure that was put into execution by the decree of the Apostle, was made a general rule for the Church, touching their dealing with all scandalous brethren in the Church, as plainly appears in the 10, 11, 12. verses of that chapter, the which I shall more clearly speak unto, when I come to examine the grounds of suspension laid down by Mr. Collins.

2. He saith, He cannot subscribe to my inclination, that self examination, mentioned 1 Cor. 11. 28. must be limited by the premises in the context, as the institution repeated doth import with some other directions and cautions given in cure of their malady, &c.

Answ. He might have done it for any strength of reason he can give to the contrary; for if those two things hold, which I have pinched upon, That the Corinthians were not blamed nor punished for personal unworthinesse at all; Nor 2. for any other actual offendings, but meerly for their profaning the Ordinance of Christ in the very time of administration; for this cause only some are weak, sick, and some are dead, vers. 30. I say, if this hold, as I believe it will, what reason

reason can any man have to judge, that the Apostle intends more in this place then the re-forming of them in those particular sins they were punished for, and blamed for. If they were punished for coming to the Sacrament in an unregenerate state, or for want of the knowledge of God in Christ, for want of love of God and of Jesus Christ, & of men, or for any other want, or miscarriage, save only this, so expressed in the context, examination might have been urged accordingly, but they being not so much as blamed for any such things in order to the Sacrament, no not in this chapter or elsewhere, what shew of reason can any man have to be so severe in urging of examination as a duty of that necessity, that if they be not able to discern the mysteries of the Kingdome of God, and to approve themselves to God to be sincere as to such particulars, which are only necessary for admittance unto heavenly glory; or else if otherwise they come, they will but eat and drink their own damnation.

When in my answer I have limited this duty of self-examination to the context, as if the Apostle had said unto them; *You being fully convinced of your former woeful abuse, and profaning this holy Ordinance of Christ, you must now judge and condemn your selves accordingly: and approve your selves according unto the right rule prescribed unto you in the institution received from Christ, understanding within your selves, what*

this holy observance doth mean, and so come and demean your selves with reverence and good order, suitable to Gods Ordinance, and then he tels them they should not be judged of the Lord.

This saith Mr. Collins is short work indeed, pag. 29.

Ans.

What though it be short of the ordinary lasts of some men that will extend this duty to an infinitum; yet until Mr. Collins, or any other can confute it, I shall judge it right work, and no whit short of the sense of this place; the which were it justly applyed to ours as it ought to be, they being members of the same visible body, and under the same rule and priviledges of the Church; and not offenders in that kinde, I think a shorter work would serve, did not men upon mistake affect to make themselves more work than they have warrant for from their Lord.

4.

But thus he saith, *The word in the Greek will not be satisfied with such a short and scant interpretation, Magistrates examine malefactors more strictly, and the Goldsmiths tryal of his gold is a more searching tryal, the Apostle expounds it 2 Cor. 13. 5.*

Ans.

You must excuse me as touching the Original, I am not able to examine it, I wish I could, I am afraid the truth will be prejudiced through mine inabilities, yet as I am informed, this makes but little to his purpose, the same word being so often used in the New Testament, and that upon different accounts

accounts, as *Rom. 2. 18. chap. 14. 18. and the 16. 10. 2 Cor. 7. 11. & 10. 18. the 13. 7. Phil. 1. 10. 2 Tim. 2. 15.* by some of these places you may see we are to approve of the things that are excellent, and good, and holy, so as to put forth our endeavours in pursuance of them, and to decline the contrary, which is all one with *1 Cor. 11. 28.* the Apostle would have the *Corinths* to approve themselves to the rules prescribed them, and so come. *2 Cor. 13. 5.* is a different thing to *1 Cor. 11. 28.* there the Apostle perceived that they questioned his authority of Apostleship, and required a proof of Christ speaking in him; the which saith the Apostle, they need not goe far for a proof of. Christ in accompanying his Word by him towards them is not weak, but mighty, *vers. 3.* and hence he bids them examine themselves, whether they be in the faith, prove your selves, that Christ is in you, and that would be a sufficient proof of Christs speaking in him, and of his Ministerial authority. Thus you may clearly see, although here is the same word, yet it's used upon a far different occasion, and therefore it doth not expound *1 Cor. 11. 28.* as Mr. Collins would have it.

Next he saith, *That another kinde of examination is here required, hath been the concurrent judgement of all Divines, especially those of the reformed Churches, &c.*

I heartily reverence the concurrent judgement

ment of all Divines, and it is my grief that I differ from them in some things, I wish that the authority of man do not cloud the truth from some; for my own part, my inabilities are such, that there can be no danger of swaying the judgement of any able Divines by my opinion, wherein I dissent from them; it must be the simplicity of truth, and the justnesse of what I maintain only, that bears me up against those I have to deal with in this controversie. I am a meer naked man that am ingaged with men of compleat harness and arms, that History, Arts, and Tongues can furnish them withall. I must confesse I am strongly perswaded of the truth of what I have writ in this controversie; and that it is the onely way to bring the Churches peace and truth together, and for Sions sake I can have no rest, but am drawn on to doe things not so well becoming my rank and calling in the Church. I beg your pardon, I hope some will confesse they can see something of God in it, excuse me, for it is not so much the judgement of Divines, as the Scripture grounds that will satisfie my spirit in this thing.

Next, pag. 30. Mr. Collins saith, *But if they be to examine themselves no more then whether they discern the Lords Body, we conceive it enough; for discerning must imply knowledge.*

1. *To know the Lords Body Sacramentally.*
2. *As the Lords Body.*

3. *As*

3. Acknowledge of the sign and thing signified in the Sacrament.

4. Acknowledge of the two natures of Christ, and of what he hath done and suffered for me.

5. And of the nature of the Sacrament, and what is held forth in it to the soul.

From hence (he saith) will easily follow an answer to the sixth query, That ignorant persons though by profession they do own the true Religion; yet are not in a capacity to examine themselves so, as to prevent the judgement, &c.

I grant that every one that comes to this *Answ. 1.* Ordinance, should be able to discern the Lords body, at least notionally by the outward signes, and that the thing signified by the instituted signes is the same, and that the bread and wine is to be received in remembrance of the death of Christ, whose blood was shed for remission of sins; but for to know the two natures of Christ, and what he hath done and suffered for me, and to understand the nature of the Sacrament distinctly; and what is held out in it to the soul, is more then the Apostle taught the Church of Corinth in order to their receiving, and therefore these requisites require further proof before he can conclude any thing from them.

In charity I judge that there is not any that live under any painful Preachers, but are so well instructed, as to understand that the Sacrament is a holy Ordinance of God ap-

pointed for the good of their souls in general. And that accordingly they humbly and reverently make their addressees unto it to receive the outward signes, in remembrance that Christ shed his blood to save sinners, &c. and this is upon the matter as much as the Apostle requires unto worthy receiving, let it be proved that such a receiving was ever blamed or punished in the holy Scriptures: if it cannot be proved, why doe men bring such needlesse troubles and distractions in the Church by their own traditions?

3. It was not so much the ignorance of the *Corinths* that was punished, as their profane actions, which they were guilty of in the time of receiving; it's a question whether their ignorance simply were punished at all any. otherwise then accompanied with those horrible effects, the which doth very rarely touch the worst of our Congregations in the Church: let Mr. *Collins* better consider of these things before he answer them: for although many of ours should be more ignorant then they of *Corinth*, yet so long as they doe not openly profane the Ordinance by their actual miscarriages at the time of worship, as the *Corinthians* did, it doth not follow that they eat and drink unworthily, and so their own damnation, as they of *Corinth*. It's true also, that the Lord may justly punish persons for their ignorance under the means. But doth it follow, that therefore
men

men may too, with debarring them from the Sacrament? I think not, untill by some clear ground of Scripture, Mr. Collins, or some other, can prove, the Eldership may. And I shall intreat them to make it good with the greatest strength they can, for otherwise they must look to be baffled in it, so long as they grant them Church-members.

I shall now see what Mr. Collins excepts against my answer to the eight query, that is, *Whether a carelesse incapable neglect of self-examination, doth excuse, and give a writ of ease from that precept, Doe this in remembrance of me.*

I.

He saith, *If I can prove this an universal precept, that concerns every individual person, that is baptized, and of years of discretion, he may tell me that such neglect makes them doub'y guilty, &c. pag. 31.* He saith further, *That he conceives that precept onely to concern the disciples of Christ, and none but true disciples.*

Answ.

I wonder what Mr. Collins will make of ours that are baptized, and externally at least adhere to the true religion, are they Pagans? If not, then they are disciples and followers of Christ by profession. And upon his own grant come under that precept, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* I am far from going about to divide these duties; I would have them examine and come too; yet the neglect of the one doth not excuse from the other: a man must not onely goe and be reconciled with his brother, but he must come and offer his gift also.

He

2. He saith, It will not much trouble him, what I have said from Matth. 28. 19, 20. the Apostles were bound to call upon those they preached unto, to observe all Christs commands, either that proves that they were to call upon Pagans to come to the Sacrament; or else to call upon all to observe such things that he had commanded them respectively, and then it will still remain to prove that Christ hath commanded an ignorant person to come to the Sacrament.

Answ. 1. It's very true, for to avoid the trouble, he is not willing to reach the argument, as you may see pag. 23. Bar removed, the argument was drawn from the charge of Christ to his Apostles in order to them, that came under baptism, not to the Pagans they preached unto; but to them that by their preaching were converted and added unto the Church by baptism. Christ chargeth them to teach his Church to observe, and doe all whatever he hath commanded them, and loe he will be with them alwayes. Where are the Apostles bid? to teach the Heathen as such? to observe all that he hath commanded? He gives his statutes and his judgements unto Israel, as for the Heathen they have not known his law. This very charge of Christ is just the language of God to the Church in Moses and the Prophets, upon the like encouragement of a blessing.

2. As Circumcision brought all the uncircumcised under all observances of the old administration.

ministration, even the Passeeover, upon their lives. So baptism layes the same ingagement upon all the baptized to come under all observances of the New Testament administration, that of the holy Supper, as well as others; hence the Apostle commends the Church of Corinth for remembering him in all things; and for keeping the Ordinances as he delivered them unto them, 1 Cor. 11. 2. and it is not good to distinguish and dispute away duty, where the Scriptures gives such a general warranty. I know not well what he means by Christs commanding respectively; if he judge that ours are within, as the Church of Corinth were; without doubt they are both under the observance and discipline of the Church. If he judge that ours that are ignorant, and scandalous, are without; then what hath he to do to judge those that are without? there is no hope to amend them by discipline, or ground to baptize their children, or to justify the main foundation of our Church.

As I said in my Book, pag. 23. *The Bar removed*, so I say again, that Jesus Christ commands nothing for the hurt of his visible subjects, they observing it according to their present capacity: Can an instance be given in the Old or New Testament of any that came under Circumcision or Baptism, that as private members were admitted to all other Ordinances in the Church, and yet were forbidden the other Sacrament,

ment, the Passcover or the Lords Supper.

3. To this Mr. Collins answers, with a meer trifle, telling us, *That it will pose me, to prove that those that had touched the dead body of a man might come at no ordinance, but he can prove they might not come to the Passcover, Numb. 9.*

Ans. Enough hath been said to this already, need but repeat Numb. 19. 13, 20, 22. The

Ver. 22.

truth is, what ever the unclean did touch, or what ever toucht him, were unclean, *Heb. 2.* Nay such persons that neglected the Law, for their purification, were to be cut off from the Congregation, because he had defiled the Sanctuary of the Lord. I might run through the several kindes of uncleannesse, and shew you how they were separated both from civil as well as holy society: but those that are acquainted with Scriptures will be satisfied in this thing. Nay as I have noted before, the Lord appointed and consecrated a season on purpose for the unclean to keep the Passcover, but not so of any other Ordinance: they were deprived of in the time of their uncleannesse.

4. Mr. Collins sayes, *Nor is that whimzy of mine, pag. 25. at all better, by which I prove the receiving of the Sacrament a duty incumbent upon all, because included in the first Table, he sayes it will pose me, to prove that this duty of receiving is commanded in the first Table; if it were, yet he hopes preaching of the Word is so also, which yet is not a duty enjoyned to all, but to those only*

only who are appointed thereto.

If that of mine must goe under the reproach of a whimzy with Mr. Collins, I know as reverend and as able Divines as Mr. Collins appears to be, that doe judge, that the affirmative part of the second Commandement includes all Gods institute worship, which at any time he hath, or shall prescribe to be done. And except Mr. Collins will deny the holy Supper to be a part of Gods instituted worship; it must come under this prescribed worship as well as any other, there being no part exprest in the command more then another, it's enough to prove, that all in the Church come under the precepts of worship; the Sacrament being so, they are bound to that as well as all other: but then he seems to grant the thing, yet he hopes so is preaching of the Word, &c. It's true, and as I had said in my Book, pag. 25, That all Ministers what ever are bound hence to preach &c. And what need we have the same again, but that he had rather puzzle then satisfie the weak? We know that which lays an injunction upon Ministers to preach, or administer, &c. doth also injoyne all their people to hear and receive as private Christians, the Commandement doth not confound relative duties, although Mr. Collins of purpose doth to deceive his Reader. And methinks it might make him blush to call that a whimzy in me, which is so ordinarily delivered

Ans.

livered by as reverend men as himself, and a great deal more. But the Judicious Reader may easily judge what poore shifts he is put unto, that excepts against the truth. Let Mr. Collins give us some rational account why persons in the Church are lesse engaged unto this part of instituted worship then all others, that all of the *Jews* Church, should come under the Law of the Passover, without exception, good and bad. And he to plead no duty to the holy Supper of persons in the Church too: they being not worse then the carnal *Jew*. I see not but upon the same ground he exempts them from this duty, he may exempt them from all others that are essential to a Church state, and so consequently not only unduty them, but unchurch them too. For what he hath said before implies no lesse, where he is bold to undisciple them, to evade this argument, we draw from the command of Christ, *Matth.* 28 20.

5. The Doctor was somewhat sharp with my much respected friend Mr. *Humfrey*, for making the act of receiving, the principal, and examination but an accessory, in my vindicating of him I hinted two or three things.

1. That the duty of self-examination is but a private duty. "And the private is to be subordinate to the publick.

" 2. This duty of examination was prescribed

scribed occasionally as a remedy to that particular case, of making a breach upon the materials of divine institution and order. And we may safely say, the end is most principal, the means less.

3. Where a true Church doth not so offend as *Corinth* did, this duty is not so to be urged upon them, as to the Church of *Corinth*. But it's clear, there is not the same offending in the Church of England, as there was at *Corinth*.

Therefore that duty is not to be urged upon ours with the same necessity of danger of eating and drinking unworthily, as to the Church of *Corinth*. Unto these Mr. Collins hath some exceptions.

1. Whether it be sense or no, he cannot tell, that I say. self-examination is a private duty, and so subordinate to the publick, and then sayes, who denies it? But yet he questions, whether upon an incapacity, or neglect of the private, the publick be a duty; for where a private duty is commanded in order to prepare us for the publick, we cannot without sin perform the publick before we have performed the private; cleansing were the unclean persons private duty: yet till it was done, he might not come to the Passover.

1. Though I grant self-examination a requisite duty unto a profitable receiving, and judge the neglect thereof sinful; yet so long as the publique administrations are carryed on with reverence and good order, besecming Gods worship externally; I would gladly

Ans.

gladly know wherein the Elderſhip is any further concerned.

2. What though an incapable neglect of the private, doth hinder the profitable uſe of the publick, and that it cannot without ſin be performed, doth it therefore follow that ſuch perſons in the Church may neglect the publick worſhip without ſin? if not, whether is the greateſt to obey, and doe as well as they can with ſin; or to caſt off all care of duty wholly? it's eaſily answered in all other duties, and but a meer begging the queſtion to deny it in this of the Sacrament, as to that inſtance of his, *Cleanſing was the unclean perſons private duty, yet till it was done, he might not eat the Paſſeover.*

Anſw.

1. It's a queſtion whether cleanſing were a private duty only, could an unclean perſon make himſelf clean? by what law, is a queſty? Numb. 6. 9, 10, 11. & 19. 19. ſpeak the contrary.

2. Grant it were, might they enter into the gates of the Sanctuary to offer unto God any other ſacrifice until they were cleanſed? We know they might not; for it was accounted a defiling the Sanctuary, a thing threatned with death, or perpetual baniſhment from the Congregation. His inſtance doth rather prove, that the juſtly excommunicate ought not to be admitted to the publick Ordinances of Worſhip, untill they be lawfully admitted upon their ſatisfying the Church by repentance.

Then

In Hezekiah's
Paſſeover of the 2.
month, many did
eat the Paſſeover
that was not clean,
and were accepted.

Then to prove persons in the Church not excommunicate may not take the Sacrament untill they have performed that private duty of examination. I have said enough, to prove that the neglect of this private duty of examination in order to receiving, doth not reach the neglect of that duty of cleansing in order unto the whole worship of God.

In his 32. pag. he is nibbling at my next thing, wherein I would have this private duty of examination occasionally prescribed as a remedy, or a means to that particular case of offending. And therefore they were to approve themselves according to the rules of institution and good order, and so come in doing the good, and declining the evill they had been punished for, &c. To this purpose, I said the end is more principal, the means lesse. Unto this Mr. Collins saith,

No man can receive the Sacrament without sin, neglecting the due means to make him a worthy receiver. He had thought due means must be necessarily supposed to the end.

Who will deny what he saith to this? But what is this to answer the thing? May the main duty of publick worship be neglected, unlesse a man be able to use all due means in order to a more comfortable and profitable receiving? If not, let them so come, as well as they can, rather then the main of Gods worship shall be omitted. By this which hath been answered unto Mr. Collins his weak

Answer:

exceptions : I hope the impartial Reader may clearly judge upon what bottome we infer free admission, namely, the authority of Christs command. Besides, you may take notice of the pitifull shifts that our adversaries are put unto, to dispute against the authority of Christs commands : Let them consider, *He that breaks the least of his commands, and teacheth men so, shall be accounted least in the Kingdom of Heaven* ; Nay, if they shall wittingly thus offend in one, they are guilty of all.

My last query is, *Whether there be any thing in the Nature, language, actions or end of the Sacrament in 1 Cor. 11. or elsewhere incongruous to the unregenerate receiving in the Church ?*

Mr. Collins saith, *Whether in 1 Cor. 11. there be any thing or no, he will not dispute, it is enough he findes it elsewhere, and he conceives there is something contrary to the receiving of the ignorant and scandalous, which is the question for the Church judgeth not of secret things.*

Ans.

What he hath said to this, hath been sufficiently answered already : he hath nothing new, but the old taken for granted, which hath been denyed according to the stating of the question. I am glad he is so sober, as to say, the Church judgeth not of secrets ; then I hope he will not proceed to censure any of his people, but for scandalous sins persisted unto obstinacy, if he, or his Eldership doe, they undertake to judge of secrets.

But then he comes more particularly to the question.

As

As first, Touching the institution, for saith he, Christ gave it to none such, he means Christ gave it to none that were ignorant or scandalous.

1. Christ gave it to none but the twelve, that were impowered with Commission to Preach and baptize, heal the sick, and to cast out Devils, &c. What then, must none but such be admitted? this would be a good argument to deny not only the cup, but the whole administration from the Laity.

But 2. The question is, whether the Apostles in their ordering of particular Congregations, gave any direction to exclude any that came under Baptism from the holy Supper, and yet allowed them the privilege of all other Ordinances in the Church. The Scripture speaks of thousands that submitted unto baptism, and continued stedfast in the Apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers, which are the main essentials of worship; and this is spoken of the whole, as soon as they were baptized. And the Church of *Corinth* are *Ad. i. 42.* commended for keeping the Ordinances. It was a profaning of this of the Supper they were blamed and punished for. And for grosse ignorance amongst them, we need not doubt of it, and other scandalous and disorderly conversation; but what is this of his, but to insinuate unto the world, that the baptized in the Church that are either ignorant,

or in some things scandalous are not of the Church: the old road of Brownism.

But then he saith secondly, *The Sacrament is contrary to such in the nature of it, for it is strong meat, and the seal of the righteousness of faith.*

Ans.

That it is strong meat onely, we deny; it remains for him to prove if he can, his say so is no proof, yet that's his great argument. He had need commence Doctor before we credit his bare word; but he gives his reason for it in his Book, pag. 104. *Strong meat belongs to men of age, who by reason of an habit have their senses exercised to discern good and evil, Heb. 5. 13, 14.*

But the Sacrament is strong meat; therefore it doth not belong to those that are babes in knowledge.

But I deny his minor; he saith it's evident, he gives his reason, *That meat which is of hardest digestion and concoction; and which not duly digested, proves most pernicious to the body, is strong meat: but such is the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.* I deny his minor again: he proves it, 1 Cor. 11. 28. and tels us, *This meat is not tasted, nor digested well without the knowing of the greater mysteries of religion in some measure, namely;*

1. *The union of Christ with the Father.*
2. *The union of the two natures in the person of Christ.*
3. *The mystical union of the soul with Christ.*
4. *The mysterious exercise of faith in applying the soul to the promise, &c. and this is all his proof, the which amounts just to as much*

as his say so : as to his quotation, 1 Cor. 11. 28. enough hath been spoken already to shew the vanity of his high flown conceptions : And indeed a most pernicious perplexing tennent to poor, doubting, weak, unsatisfied Christians, should it be believed. I have alwayes been taught, that Sacraments are the lowest condescensions of the love of Christ to his weakest babes, they being suted so familiarly to our bodily senses, as it were with *Thomas*, his seeing and feeling the body of Christ was more effectual to make him believe, then the testimony of their word who preached Christ was risen indeed.

But the next he saith, *The Sacrament is the seal of the righteousness of faith* ; and hence it seemes incongruous to the ignorant and scandalous that have not faith.

The question is of the unregenerate in the Church, the which may be discernable by these Characters of ignorant, and scandalous in part, and know that I have nothing to say in behalf of them that hate instruction, and that persist in their vile abominable doings, after admonition and due conviction unto obstinacy. Let such be declined and avoided as unworthy of all Christian Communion, and spare not ; but for those that are yeelding sinners, and are ready to condemn themselves upon all occasions, it being wisely dealt withall, expressing themselves willing and desirous to amend ;

Ans.

these I think should have the benefit of all the Ordinances, as the ordinary means of their salvation. But now to his assertion, *That the Sacrament is the seal of the righteousness of faith.*

1. We know that Sacraments which had their Original from God unto *Abraham*, *Gen. 17.* were tokens of the everlasting Covenant of grace, made with *Abraham* and his seed, God having deputed him to be a father of many Nations. And that all the Nations of the earth shall be blessed in him, &c. Circumcision was appointed to be a token unto *Abraham* in this comprehensive sense, that not only they that were his seed by natural descent, but those also that shall embrace the profession of the faith of *Abraham*, shall be blessed with him, even they, and their natural issue also. And the Apostle, *Rom. 4. 4.* descants much upon this large Covenant, or promise made unto *Abraham*, in the warranty of the *Gentiles* engrafting into the stock of *Abraham* by faith; the which the *Jews* stumbled at, and fell into prejudices and discontents upon the *Gentiles* embracing of the Gospel, concluding it false, because they imbraced it, that were always left of God, and so abominable to the Church as naturally descended from *Abraham* and the Prophets, &c. The Apostle disputes this thing with them, and saith, *Is he a God of the Jews only, is he not of the Gentiles also?*

Yes

Yes of the Gentiles also, chap. 3. 29. And he tells them their fleshly priviledges, according to the Law, will not continue them the people of God without faith in Christ. And by faith in Christ the *Gentiles* are made the people of God unto Justification, opposing faith unto works chiefly in point of Justification, as in the beginning of the 4. chapter is expressed in that instance of *Abraham* and *David*. It was not works, but faith, that was reckoned unto *Abraham* for righteousness in his uncircumcised state : and hence he argues *Abraham* to be a father of the uncircumcision, as well as of the circumcision ; because he received the token of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of that faith he had in his uncircumcision, that he might be the father of all that believe , that righteousness might be imputed to them also, and a father of the believing circumcision too , &c. Now then what was the main thing that *Abraham* is thus commended for , and blessed for ? Why it's said, *He believed God, and that was imputed unto him for righteousness.* But then we may enquire, what was the thing he believed God would be as good as his word to him in ? Answer. It was this, that God had made him a father of many Nations, though he had no child ; yet he believed against hope, &c. And this was imputed unto him for righteousness. We know that *Abraham* after the flesh was not a father

of many Nations; that is not the sense, but he is so in a spiritual sense by religion and faith, and that's the thing the Apostle drives at, to prove him a father of all that come in unto his religion and faith; And that all such are of him, and blessed with him. And doubtlesse *Abraham* that saw this day of *Christ* and rejoyced, so understood it, that all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed in him, by faith; and this blessednesse to begin in his own natural family; and to be extended unto all Nations in time. And hence that is true, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed in their generations for ever, Gen. 17. 7.* and that he should be the father of many Nations, and that they should be blest in him, &c. This is the everlasting Covenant of Grace that *Abraham* believed, and this is the faith that circumcision was a token of, and did confirm the truth of, to him and all that are in him by religion for ever, even to them and theirs: and I doubt not but the Sacrament seals to the same faith still in reference to them that have entered the same Covenant, and professe their subjection to the laws and administration thereof. but I have not exprest my self in this so fully and clearly, as I could wish, I shall have occasion to doe more in it hereafter. This by the way to give a hint, what the Apostle means, in calling circumcision a seal of the righteousnesse of that faith that *Abraham* yet had in uncircum-

uncircumcision, it being too ambiguously left and applyed by Mr. Collins in order unto Church-members unregenerate.

Mr. Collins hath two or three things more in the 32. pag. but finding nothing in them that doth trouble us about the question in hand, I passe them by, though it's true, he takes the boldnesse to deny, yet he doth not give any ground or reason why, but takes all for granted still, though I have rationally cleared the contrary in my answer to the query, pag. 36, 37, 38, 39. Bar removed.

I shall now see what he excepts against my 6. proposition, pag. 30. 31.

I conceive that Sacraments in general, and this in particular were instituted for the spiritual good of the Church of Christ, comprehensively taken in which every particular member is included.

1.

First he grants as much, pag. 33. and then addes, his *jus ad rem*, and then queries, how this proves that therefore every particular member ought in his present state come to it, and coming ought to be admitted.

1.

If the proposition be true, as is granted it is, then it will follow that all Church-members should be encouraged unto the per-taking of that which is for their spiritual good. And it's most injurious for any to deprive any of that spiritual good, that proffer themselves, or discourage them so to doe.

Ans.

But

But he hath two things to except against the consequence.

1. He saith, *Was not the Paschever so appointed, yet he thinks unclean persons might not come during their uncleanness?*

Answ. 1. But now there is no such uncleanness in the Gospel Church to hinder any.

2. They were no more debarred the Paschever then all other publick worship, nor so much for provision was made for them in that case not in the other.

3. And as that of Moral uncleanness was no hinderance then, so not now, as hath been shewed, and hence his first exception is worth nothing.

But then 2. he tels us, *That some reverend men think the excommunicate person is yet a member of the Catholick Church, and shall not be baptized upon his repentance: and he owning the true religion, and being baptized, his repentance being supposed, the Sacrament is for his good; but it will not therefore follow, he ought in that state of his excommunication to come to the Sacrament.*

Answ. 1. It's not material to the question, whether the excommunicate be dismembred or not; it's sufficient to my purpose, that he be dispossessed of all external priviledges of the Church during his impenitency, in that condition he is justly sentenced unto, to debar him the Sacrament. And I think all parties are agreed in this, and in this case I deny that the Sacrament is for his good, while

he

he is under the last remedy and Ordinance of Christ for his amendment or utter ruine.

Then if you suppose his repentance and satisfying the Church, he ought to be loosed from that sentence, and received into Church communion again.

That the justly excommunicate are absolutely dismembred is too harsh to affirm, until we be able to judge that he hates to be reformed under the Churches just censures, adding unto his incorrigible sinning, not only obstinacy, but Apostasie. And then he is undone for ever. For what the Church bindes on earth, is bound in heaven; though the Churches main end is onely to reform and heal a diseased member. Therefore though I should grant him not absolutely dismembred, and yet deny him the Sacrament; it doth not follow that Church-members under Church indulgence or forbearance, may be denied the Sacrament. These are two different cases. And therefore doth not in the least hurt my first proposition.

My second proposition is, *That the Church of Christ consists of good and bad.* And this Mr. Collins grants me also. And it having such a dependence on the first, that it compleats for my opinion this argument.

The holy Supper is instituted for the spiritual good of every particular member of the Church.

But

But this Church of Christ consists of good and bad, regenerate and unregenerate; therefore the holy Supper is instituted for the spiritual good of good and bad, regenerate and unregenerate, and consequently is to be administered to them in order to that good.

I conceive that both propositions being granted, the conclusion cannot be denied.

My third is, *That the unregenerate in the Church are the only immediate objects of the promise of the first grace.*

Mr. Collins answers unto this thus, *That he had rather say, that the unregenerate are objects of the first grace, than of the promise of that grace, for the promises profit not any without faith, and but the unregenerate should apply the promise, he cannot tell.*

Ans.

1. In granting them objects of the first grace, he grants them to be objects of the promise of that grace. Unless the first grace is not at all to be lookt for from the promise.

2. Nor promised unto any at all.

3. Or else given to some to whom God never promised it. The which things to affirm would be point blank against the Scriptures. So that the question is, whether Mr. Collins doth own any such thing as promises of giving the first grace at all. For if there be any such promises at all made to the Church in general, they must of necessity immediately respect some proper object that hath

hath not that grace, of, and in it self; it is want and misery that is the proper object of grace and mercy : But why should Mr. Collins expresse himself thus doubtfully in such a main thing. Doth he not baptize all Infants upon this account chiefly that the promise is to the Parents and children? surely if they be not objects of the promises of the first grace, the most of ours every where are objects of no promises that Sacraments seal; for it's too certain, that they and theirs have not a true sincere purifying faith to apply the other promises of salvation. This is certain, if they be not objects of the promises of the first grace, they cannot be objects of the promises of crowning that grace with glory : exclude the unregenerate in the Church from the promise of the first grace, and you exclude them from all. And then judge what will follow.

And where he saith, *The promises profit not any without faith*, shall the want of a sincere faith make the faithfulness of God without effect? God forbid. Let God be true in what he hath promised to the Church in general, and indefinite terms, and every man a liar, *Rom. 3. 3, 4.* We know of the *Jews* that were the greatest enemies unto Christ, a remnant of them were sanctified and saved, according unto *Act. 2. 39.* Peter tels the wicked *Jews* that were guilty of the innocent blood of Christ, that the promise is to them and their children, before he knew whether they

they would repent or no. What faith had they when *Peter* told them so? not so as much as ours have that generally believe that *Christ* is the only Saviour of the world. These *Jews* denied this, yet being of the visible Church as descended from *Abraham*, the Apostle made them and their children objects of the promises; and hence perswades them to repent of what they had done against *Christ*, & be baptized for remission of sins, &c. And so many that received his word were baptized indeed, and submitted themselves to the obedience of faith. What though the unregenerate cannot actually apply those promises by faith unto themselves? Doth it follow that therefore they are not objects, or susceptibles of them in a passive sense, God being free in making these promises unto them, and by his Spirit in the use of his own appointments to apply them effectually unto whom he will, of such that have not faith to apply them: Forasmuch as not any can in a strict sense believe, until he be impowered with regenerating grace: No, nor then, without the concurrence of a divine aid to apply the promises made to such a blessed state to their own comfort and salvation.

Besides, the promises of the first grace are not only free, but absolute, not so depending upon condition of faith in a strict sense, as many other promises doe: yet not so absolute, but that the ordinary means of salvation

tion ought to be observed diligently in order to attainment of the first grace : for God will be enquired after by the house of Israel, for the grace of the New Covenant, Ezek. 36.

My fourth proposition is, That the whole administration of the Covenant belongs to those in the Church, that are the immediate objects of the absolute promises, in order to the Lords putting these promises into execution.

Mr. Collins saith, If the argument be good, it's fetcht from the right, which an interest in the Covenant promises gives one to the seals of it. And when it must hold universally, and if the unregenerate world without be as much objects of the first grace, as those within, there is no reason for that restriction.

1.

It seems, Mr. Collins would not have the promises of first grace be limited unto the Church, but would have the unregenerate out of the Church as much objects as those within : for indeed he is ready at every pinch to level the unregenerate in the Church to the infidel world.

Answer.

Therefore I shall endeavour to clear unto you the difference in this particular, briefly ; it may be I may publish more of this hereafter.

It is evident, that the whole Covenant of grace is made unto the Church in general terms without any exception of persons in it, as is clear, Jer. 31. Heb. 8. Ezek. 36. *A new Covenant I will make with the house of Judah*

1.

dah and Jerusalem: in which Covenant the promise of the first grace is most expresse and full: the state of the *Jews* Church consisting most of carnal members, that were proper objects of the promises of first grace. Why the *Gentile* world as carnal, and be miserable, yet this Covenant containing the first grace was never made to them at all, but upon condition of faith, and grafting themselves into the same visible body: as they are Infidels and without, *They are aliens from the Common-wealth of Israel, strangers to the Covenant of promises, and without all hope: and without God in the world, Ephes. 2. 12.* How can they be said to be as much objects of the promise of the first grace that are without, as they that are within; when they are alienated from all, during that Infidel state? It's true there is a promise, that all the Nations of the earth shall be blessed in *Abraham*; but it runs in conditional terms, as they are to him, they must first be brought into him, and be of the true Church that *Abraham* was father of, before they can be blessed in him, and so the Apostle expounds it, *They that are of faith, are blessed with him, and ye are all, even the whole Church, Jews and Gentiles, the children of Abraham by faith in Christ Jesus.* And not any others in the world that remained in their infidel estate.

This difference is clearly intimated by the Apostle *Peter, Act. 2. 39.* when he speaks of the

the *Jews* that were of the Church by nature as descended from *Abraham*, he tells them plainly, *The promise is to them and their children*, speaking in the present tense. But then speaking of the *Gentiles*, he saith, the promise is intended unto them also, but with another restriction then to the *Jews*, *even unto as many as it shall please the Lord our God to call of them*, at any time for the future, and to none else: they of the infidel world must be externally called at least, and planted into the visible Church of Christ by baptism, before they and theirs can be children of the promise, and in Covenant relation.

As the Pagan world is without the promise of the first grace, so we know they are without the ordinary means of working that grace, if they be as much objects of the promise of first grace, as the unregenerate in the Church. What's the reason the Lord denyes them the ordinary means of putting them into execution? The Apostle saith, *If our Gospel be hid, or withheld from persons or people, it's hid to them that perish.*

Our own experience will convince us, that those that are without are not so much objects of the promise of first grace as them within: because we see the fruit of it in the Church in every age and time, in the conversion of many; but scarce any age of a hundred generations we have heard of any conversions in some parts of the Pagan world.

H

Hence

3.

4.

Hence I judge there is a real difference between the Church and the Pagan world; in respect of the one they are objects of the promises, the other without promise and hope, and God in the world; and me thinks Mr. Collins, and the friends of his judgement, (they being godly, sober, Orthodox Divines) should be satisfied with this difference, I have only hinted at in short; for my part, I think there is nothing more clear, and easie to be made out from holy Scriptures, were not men of his judgement too much learned with Brownism, destroying that which our first reformers have planted. I must confesse it's nothing becoming my calling and abilities to challenge any learned reverend men; yet I doubt not but through the assistance of Gods grace, to maintain this difference I have in short laid down, against all the contradiction of sober Orthodox men: provided they will dispute it from the authority of holy Scriptures, and what may be clearly and rationally deduced thence. Next

Mr. Collins is pleased to put my proposition into form, pag. 34.

Those to whom the absolute promises of the Covenant belong, to those the whole administration of the Covenant; and so the seals belong.

But to the unregenerate in the Church, and of years the promises belong.

Ergo.

He saith, Let but [belong] in each proposition be under-

understood in the same sense, and the answer is easie, and the argument weak, &c.

I will yeild him that which he desires, and take it in that sense which is most large, namely, that the promises of first grace belong to the unregenerate in the Church, then he denies the major, and saith, *That by this argument Heathens may come to the Sacrament.* Answ.

I say no, unless Mr. Collins can prove that the Heathen are as much objects of the absolute promises in the Covenant, as the unregenerate in the Church. I think when he hath performed that task soundly and undeniably, I shall yeild the argument weak, and think the worse of my cause: but untill then, he must give me leave to think the argument strong, for any thing he hath yet said in answer of it.

He only saith it, *That no promise doth so belong to any unregenerate man, as his portion which he may cleave and make use of it in his unregeneracy.*

What thinks Mr. Collins then of the baptizing the Infants of such, the usual practise of our Church? How can he perswade such to offer their children unto baptism, if no promise belong to him to make use of as his? is not his childes baptism a considerable use? Answ. 3.

The absolute promise of the first grace to the unregenerate, is the main encouragement to the use of means for the attainment of grace; This is that which opens a door

of hope unto all, and as they are sinners destitute of the work of grace, they may rightly goe to God and pray for a new heart, and for his Spirit to beget regenerating grace in their gracelesse spirits. *Ob turn thou us Lord, and we shall be converted unto thee, for thou never saidst to the seed of Jacob, Seek yee my face, in vain.* And we are the seed of thy Church and people, whom thou hast promised to be a God unto, and to make us thy people, for thy names sake, forsake us not, but put forth the work of thy mighty power, to open our hearts to receive the grace of thy promise, we are objects of, and without which we are undone. I say ask, and you shall have; for the Lord will give his Spirit to them that ask it. And this I hope is of good use to the unregenerate. It's a special ground to pray for renewing grace themselves; and likewise for others that have grace to pray for them, as Ministers for their people, and parents for their children, &c. Exclude them from these promises and you exclude them from your prayers, for we have no warrant to pray for that which God doth not promise to give.

My fifth proposition, *That the Sacraments being visible representations of Christs death, on which those promises are founded, and by which they are confirmed, the use of the Sacraments belongs to those whom those promises doe immediately respect.*

Unto this he hath nothing considerable, but what hath been answered already; only

he grants the main of this. And yet sayes, that
Sacraments are seals as well as signs.

1. Sacraments are seals as they are signes, *Answ.*
and not otherwise.

2. They are but representatives of the real seal that confirms the absolute promises, namely the death of Christ, and so not seals properly, but by way of resemblance, giving the name to the signs, that is only proper to the thing signified, namely, the death of Christ, it being all one to imagine the Sacraments real seals of the Covenant, with real presence. If I mistake not, hence it will follow, That which the death of Christ is a seal of, Sacraments are seals of: but the death of Christ is a seal of the promises of first grace, which respect the unregenerate in the Church: therefore the use of these seals belong to them. I see not but that the Sacraments, as they are seals to confirm the truth of the Covenant, in which are included promises of first grace to the unregenerate in the Church, the unregenerate may use the seals for their encouragement to wait upon God, in the use of that and all ordinary means, in hope of the blessing of regenerating grace, according to what is promised in the Word, and sealed in the Sacrament; who else should use the seals, if not those that have a right unto what is sealed, should not?

But then he saith, *It is false, that the use of the Sacraments belongs to such as the promises of first grace*

grace doe respect, for then the use of the Sacrament belongs to Heathens: but the use of it belongs to those only who by faith apply the promise.

Ans.

So long as any creatures are without letter, and external administration of the Covenant, and have not so much as access to the outward tender, and made entrance therein by baptism; they are strangers from the Covenant of promise, and without a literal ground of hope; and without God I have shewed the difference already: though I have granted elsewhere, that Heathen are objects of the promise of grace in some remote sense, yet it's hard to say of any Nation in special, so long as the Lord is pleased to withhold the ordinary means of their conversion from them, that they are objects of that promise. This is a certain truth, where the Lord hath a people to save, he will either send his Word to call them; or bring them under the Word by some providence or other to that end: as for those that are left to wander in their own idolatrous wayes, there is no hope to such, *If the Gospel be hid, it's hid to them that perish.* And whereas Mr. Collins saith, *The Sacrament belongs only to those who by faith apply the promise.* Alas, this he takes for granted, although he knows we have denyed it upon considerable ground. Take faith in his sense, can any man imagine that all the people of the Jews were able by faith to apply the promises? yet they

they were all bound to keep the Pasſeover: Conceive how improbable it were, that all that ſubmitted unto baptiſm in the Apoſtles age, were able by a true faith to apply the promiſes: yet none were denied the Supper that came under Baptiſm. Doth Mr. Collins think, that all in our Church are able by a true ſincere faith to apply the promiſes? Yet we adminiſter baptiſm unto their children, a ſeal of the ſame promiſes, upon the account of their parents. And I verily judge that the parents are in as good a capacity for the holy Supper, as their children are for holy baptiſm; If the childes right may be derived more remote, then much more the Parents of that childe as being a generation neerer that right. If the promiſe include the grand childe, much more his own childe; And wherein is the holy Supper a different ſeal of the Covenant from baptiſm? So that in giving Baptiſm to their child, you clearly yeeld their right to uſe the Supper, provided they be not excommunicated.

But Mr. Collins argues againſt me thus, in his late Book, pag. 104. *Thoſe who if they were Heathens might not be baptiz'd, though they be baptiz'd, and in the Church ought not to be admitted to the Lords Supper.*

But thoſe who are ignorant and ſcandalous, if they were Heathens, ſhould not be baptiz'd.

Ergo,

I grant his minor is true, that ignorant

Anſw.

and scandalous Heathens should not be baptized. But I deny his Major, that ignorant and scandalous Christians are Heathens. Suppose them unbaptized, which they are not; for I will suppose that their Covenant relation holds still, though they were unbaptized, they being the issue of persons in the Church, and they never as yet have renounced the Covenant, but adhere to the publick administration thereof: which may be the case of some in these exorbitant times for there are many a growing up to years of discretion, that through the delusion of their parents are unbaptized, the which I think are no Heathen, being Christians born, nor cut off from Covenant relation, nor Church-membership, notwithstanding their parents wickedness to dispute them out of the Covenant, and consequently out of the Church, and so from baptism a privilege thereof: but they ought to be baptized when ever themselves, or any other of their friends desire it for them, upon the account of membership, it not being their fault it hath been neglected so long, but their parents. And I say likewise of the ignorant and scandalous born in the Church, were they unbaptized, the Church ought to use all means possible, to perswade them unto it as their special duty to engage them unto better obedience, and Church discipline for their amendment. The children of *Israel*

were uncircumcised a great many of them while they were in their travel in the Wilderness; their uncircumcision did not discover nor unchurch them; but they were all circumcised when they came to *Canaan*. God was angry with *Moses* for neglecting the circumcising of his sons, but yet their Covenant relation held, they must be circumcised. And I think here is nothing against reason in all this. But then there is not the like reason for Heathen to be baptized, that are ignorant and scandalous, because they are strangers from the Covenants of promise, have no such privilege as Covenant relation, they are unclean, and untill they embrace the faith of the Gospel, and express themselves real in their acceptance of it, and promise to joyn themselves with the visible professing body of Christ, they may not be received. These are two huge different things, which Mr. *Collins* all along levels to the same, and therefore his argument falls to nothing. And I would have Mr. *Collins*, and all others that professe themselves friends to the Church of *England*, to beware how they maintain that Baptism makes Church-members: it's true of those that are of the Pagan world by nature, they can in no wise be made members of the visible Church of Christ but by lawful baptism: but those in the Church that are born of Christian parents are members born, they being comprehended in

in the same Covenant with their parents.

But Mr. Collins in proof of his major saith, *It is against reason to say the contrary.* A notable proof indeed ! Let him shew us what reason it's against, to say, that Church-members unbaptized, ought to be baptized upon lower personal qualifications then Heathens.

I come to my next proposition, *That they in the Church whom we cannot exclude from Covenant relation, that are of years, must not be excluded from the Sacrament, because Sacraments are seals of Covenant love to that people that are in possession of Covenant administrations.*

Mr. Collins in answer to this, is fallen upon the old businesse again, and wonders how years of discretion comes in, for he saith, *the argument is to prove a right to Covenant seals, for such as are in Covenant relation.* Now children are in Covenant relation, that exception plainly implies, say he, *that Covenant relation is not enough to give right to Covenant seals.* And so he sayes, *I have answered my self.*

Ans. 1. Mr. Collins is more happy then others, if such an answer be judged a sufficient one, because years of discretion, is no essential of Covenant relation, but of a man, putting him into an actual capacity to perform acts of worship, the which until then he is not under the obligation of actual observance. I have spoken enough to this already. Why is not Covenant relation enough ? I never thought so ; but maintain that Covenant relation

relation gives right to Covenant seals unto parentes and children. I hope I am as clear in this point as most are. It's an handsome shifting of an answer, to say, I have answered my self: The argument lies to answer still. If Sacraments be seals of covenant love to a people in possession of covenant administrations, then such a people ought to use these seals of Covenant love unto them in remembrance thereof, untill they be legally dispossessed of the same. But ours are in Covenant relation, and in possession of the Ordinances of the Covenant. Therefore it belongs to them to make use of the seals of Gods love in remembrance of his goodnesse towards them. Untill you can discovenant them it's a weak thing to goe about to dispriviledge them in the externals of the Church; especially the Ordinances being the Ordinary way and means of attaining the grace of the Covenant.

In his 35. pag. he tels us, *That Sacraments are not seals of the everlasting Covenant, but seal to the acceptation of the Covenant to which faith must be supposed.*

I have alwayes thought that the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his seed, and so often published and repeated, and explained to the *Jews* Church, and applyed to the Gospel Church, *Heb. 8.* had been an everlasting Covenant of grace; and that Sacraments seal to this Covenant: And that not only the new

Cove-

Ans.

Covenant, but the seals thereof belong unto the visible Church. And that the agreement or Covenant between the Father and the Son, for the elect, had been a different thing from the Covenant made unto the Church, which Sacraments seal. If that were not an everlasting Covenant that Circumcision was a sign and seal of, I must confesse I am out; but I am sure it's that which I have been always taught, and never heard it denyed, but by Anabaptists, and such like Heterodox spirits. It's true, this everlasting Covenant is to be entred into by those the seals are to be applyed unto; and this entrance or acceptance is either personal or parental. An alien upon profession of faith, and desiring to joyne himself to the visible Church of Christ by baptism, and so to come voluntarily under the Laws of Christ, is to be received, he hath accepted of the laws of the Covenant. But for those that are in the Church by nature, and professe no other religion and worship but the true, are all supposed to have such a faith at least as doth argue their acceptance of the Covenant, during their abode in the Church, the which is sufficient to ingage them unto Christian obedience, and doth entitle them to external Church priviledges; although this is not enough in order to their justification and salvation: but yet the external part is the way prescribed for the attainment of the internal blessings of the everlasting

lasting Covenant, even to as many in the Church that Jesus Christ was sent into the world to seek and to save, by giving them repentance and remission of sins. Hence it is very necessary to distinguish of a twofold acceptation; one common that accepts of the external part of the Covenant, which repro- bates doe with the elect, the other is internal and special, when God by his Spirit opens the heart, and inclines the will to receive the grace of the Covenant unto eternal life: the former is that which gives right to the external priviledges of the Church; the other to the internal blessings of grace and glory. The former hath the promise of the first grace, the other the promise of increase in grace, and the reward of glory. If that be true of Mr. Collins, *That Sacraments seal to the acceptation of the Covenant which supposes faith*: It's sufficient for our opinion, because all in the Church doe accept of the Covenant, and have faith. And we doe not plead for Heathens untill they believe and come under baptism. But surely the death of Christ confirmed the ever- lasting Covenant, out of which faith with the fruits thereof freely flow. And I think Sacraments are no other wayes seals, then they are signs of his death; as it is said, *This cup is the new Covenant in my blood*, the cup was not really the new Covenant, but a sign thereof, representatively; as I have hinted before: Yet surely, saith Mr. Collins, *those that are in a state of unbelief*

unbelief, are not in Covenant, though they may be objects of Gods first free grace.

Ans. If they be not in the everlasting Covenant, they cannot be said to be objects of Gods first free grace: for doubtlesse God gives grace to none that are out of that Covenant, himself grants that the elect are enrolled in the everlasting Covenant, and many of them may be in the Church, I hope, though in a state of unbelief in his sense; and doubtlesse it is for the elects sake that we have an external administration, a Church consisting of most bad, that his elect may be gathered out of all sorts of sinners, and others left without excuse, is this wise contrivance of the ever blessed God. And hence this mingled state of good and bad must grow together untill the harvest, experience doth tell us what precious wheat hath sprung out of the roots of wicked tares. And wicked tares have sprung out of the roots of the choycest wheat: let that convince us.

Mr. Collins saith, *That argument about baptism hath been answered again and again.* The argument is this, *If parents that are ignorant and scandalous in the Church, be so much in Covenant as to give their children right unto holy baptism, a seal of the Covenant, then themselves have right to the holy Supper, it being but the seal of the same Covenant.*

The antecedent is granted by Mr. Collins, and all that are friends to his judgement, and

and yet they deny the consequence, because they say more is required to the Lords Supper, then unto Baptism. Unto this I answer.

It cannot be proved, that in the Apostles days more was required unto the Supper then to baptism of persons of years: it's clear enough, that which prepared them for baptism brought them into the Church. And that being once within, they had the privileges of the Church accordingly, is without question.

Lesse is required unto Covenant seals of persons born in the Church, (they being free born to all the privileges of this spiritual Corporation) then of those that are aliens and strangers by birth; these obtain their freedom upon the terms of faith and repentance.

The ignorant and scandalous are in as good a capacity of the Supper of the Lord, as their children are of the baptism of the Lord, they being under Church indulgence.

First, They are in an active capacity of exercising the understanding heart and conscience, memory, with all the externals required unto that service, their children are meerly passive for the other.

Secondly, Parents are in possession of the seals of themselves, but their children before baptism are not.

Parents in the Church derive as much right from

1.

2.

3.

4.

from their Ancestors, as their children doe untill they be discovenanted, if not more, as being a generation neerer that right.

5. If parents Covenant relation be sufficient to give right to the seals for his childe, then surely for himself.

6. Besides the contradiction in the other opinion of Mr. Collins; as first, he pleads the Covenant for the parents unto their childrens baptism; and then disputes them out of Covenant in his admission unto the holy Supper. They shall be accounted believers as to the one, but unbelievers as to the other. The promise is to them and their children in order unto baptism, but then in order to the holy Supper, there is no more promise belongs unto them then unto Pagans. And there is no promise made to any that have not faith to apply them; and so exclude children from the promise too at last, for they have not such a faith as to apply the promises. Thus you may see he is a Presbyterian in practice; and an Anabaptist in opinion. For if his judgement be true about baptism, then it's false about the holy Supper; if his judgement be true about the Supper, then it's false about baptism: for both are the same seal of the same Covenant exhibited, only by different signs. People had need be well settled and satisfied of themselves in these times, that keep their station in the Church, where they have such Teachers,
and

and meet with such opinions that destroy all. The truth is, our straightnesse in the one, and largenesse in the other, doth destroy it self; and doth occasion most intelligent Christians, either to fall off from Infant baptism, or else to restrain it to those that are judged fit to be received into holy Communion in the Lords Supper. Had it not been for our own scruples about admitting to the Supper, casting off the most of Church-members from Communion, under the notion of ignorant and scandalous, we had never known of these exorbitances in the Church, which now we suffer under by the separations.

It is an easie thing for Mr. Collins to say the argument is answered again and again, not telling us by whom; nor how. But if it be not better answered then he hath done it in his answer to Mr. Barksdel, he must answer it again, or else it must be unanswered, and cleave close unto him still as such a Church-
rent that he will never free himself of, unless he alter his judgement: which he will finde the readiest way of the two.

In his 15. pag. to Mr. Barksdels 10. argument for free admission he puts in three exceptions.

He grants children are baptized in their parents right; but yet can see no reason, why it should necessarily be the immediate parent.

True, for sometimes it may fall out, that both parents may be excommunicate, or

I.

Ans.

turn'd Apostates : in these cases it's not necessary ; but otherwise being of the true Christian Church and faith , the ignorant and scandalous being in actual Church-membership, and baptized ; give as true a legal right to their child's baptism, as any other member what ever : so long as their own right holds , their child's right doth also, and that immediately from them, is to the sober unquestionable. Indeed if parents be never so really godly and unbaptized, their children's right to baptism must either be derived from Ancestors, or else have none at all, a visible profession of faith in persons baptized gives a true right for their childe to the Sacramental seal, and consequently for themselves to the same seal of the Supper ; there was the same danger for the neglect of the Passover, as for circumcision.

2. He saith further, *There is no self-examination prerequired unto baptism : but to the Supper a man must examine himself, and so let him come.*

Ans. Philip put it upon the Ethiopian Eunuch, to examine whether he believed with all his heart or no in order unto baptism. And I think that was more then the other of Paul to the Corinthians. Baptism to men of years was upon the condition of a personal faith, without which they might not be baptized, implied by this, *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst, otherwise not, but there is*

no such thing in order to the Supper : they were to examine themselves , and so come, it cannot be reasonably conceived of, that if they neglected this private duty, they should not come, for it was their duty to come together to celebrate the Supper, but not to profane it for the worse. Profession of faith was a publick duty in order to baptism, without which they could not be baptized : but examination but a private duty left to God and our own consciences, which no publick officers have to doe with concerning others, but to instruct and to exhort unto the duty, &c. they have not the like warrant to require an account whether the private hath been performed, much lesse to debar them upon a supposal of non-performance, or prejudice of their incapacity before hand, and so discourage from coming together, for which we have not one syllable of warrant: but I have spoken enough to this already. Remember the abuse of the Brazen Serpent.

He saith, *The children of the legally unclean were not forbid circumcision, but the unclean man might not eat the Passeeover.* 3.

The unclean during his uncleanness, *Ans^r. 1.* might not circumcise his child, circumcision being instituted a token of the Covenant, which an unclean man might no more defile and make unclean, then any other religious service. And what though it were

to be done the eight day, it might be rejoined for a week upon the same reason as the Passeeover was for a month, and circumcision in another case for forty years: we know the rule in cases of necessity, God will rather have mercy then sacrifice.

2. There is no legal uncleanness in the Church now, and therefore this doth not so much as reach the argument; and indeed his other two, are as little for his turn: he must finde a better answer then so, or tell us where to finde one, or else the argument will cleave so close that he will be forced to narrow Infant baptism unto the holy Supper, or enlarge the Supper unto Infant Baptism, or be irrational and absurd in so flat a contradiction, as hath been hinted.

And to prevent some mistake, let me intreat the Reader carefully to consider, That although I have said, that more is required unto the Supper then unto Baptism. It is to be understood in the Church of persons that are Church-members by nature. But of Aliens, I conceive more is required of them unto baptism, then of Church-members unto the Supper, especially when they were members by birth priviledge. The ground is this, because a publick profession of faith is necessary for the admitting of a Heathen into the visible Catholick Church, by baptism. And so of his entring the Gospel Covenant for himself and seed: but to them that

that are in Covenant by birth, it is otherwise, their Covenant right remains untill it be forfeited by renouncing the Covenant, or hating to be reformed by the Churches just censures. And while they are in the Covenant, and in the Church, they may not be denied the external priviledges thereof, although they be transgressors of the Covenant, &c. But to proceed, and come more close to the query in hand, namely, *Whether there be any thing in the nature, end, action, language of the Sacrament, incongruous to the unregenerate in the Church receiving, in 1 Cor. 11. or elsewhere.* To which I have in the general, shewed a congruity between the Sacrament and the unregenerate in the Church; And have answered unto Mr. Collins exceptions against me. Now we come more directly to the query, and to what is excepted against us. I must confesse in *pag. 36. Bar removed*, there is a great mistake, but who were faulty in it, I cannot well tell, the 19. line is out of place, and is to be prefixed to my three arguments, to prove the Sacrament a converting Ordinance, *pag. 40.* for that which follows *page 36. line 19.* is to demonstrate a suitability or congruity in the Sacrament to the unregenerate mans receiving, where the particulars of the question are examined and cleared. And hence Mr. Collins follows the mistake, and makes himself merry with those three new arguments, as he had thought they were:

but he findes the first as old as *Paul's* sleepes. And the third proves a Monks right to the Sacrament, in his pag. 35, 36.

Answ. I confesse my nature inclines me too much to give him returns futable unto his vein of levity, but I shall rather choofe to keep to the question and inform the Reader again, touching this question in hand.

- I. I laid down the nature of the Sacrament to be a visible Gospel, representing Christ and him crucified to the outward senses of the body, to that end that they might be the inlets of the soul to give the application of the benefits of Christs death to the heart and conscience. And I thought the unregenerate in the Church have as much need of the use of all their senses to understand Christ and him crucified, and to apply the benefits that come by him, as the regenerate and more, they being more dull to understand, or to be affected with the benefits and blessings that come to sinners by vertue thereof. Unto this.

Mr. Collins saith, *Bravely concluded! from need to right is wide concluding.*

Answ. I. I conclude from the nature of the Sacrament, &c. That therefore the unregenerate in the Church have need to be allowed the use of all their senses, to let in the knowledge of Christ as the regenerate, they being more dull, &c. And hence I conceive a congruity unto such, he sayes, *from need to right*

right is wide concluding. The question is not to prove a right, but a congruity, or rather to free the unregenerate from the charge of incongruity, &c. unto which Mr. Collins excepts nothing against the nature of it.

In spiritual things unto the Church, I 2.
much question whether it be wide concluding from need to right. I am sure need and wants are the only objects of Gods free bounty in giving Christ, and all he gives with him, *With him the fatherlesse and desolate finde mercy.* If any want wisdom, let them ask it of God who gives freely. What though from need to right doth not alwayes hold in the Courts of men; it's a good plea in the Court of free grace, and well taken when sinners come off, in the use of Gods own appointments, for the obtaining of a blessing of supply unto their necessities.

In the next place, we are to examine what 2.
Mr. Collins excepts against the end of the Sacrament, as I have exprest my self, pag. 37. *The Bar removed*, as touching the query in hand, *The end of the Sacrament is to put the Church in minde of the death of Christ, and that satisfaction made by him, by which all the saving blessings of the Covenant are procured unto saln man. Christs blood was shed for many, for remission of sins. That he might gather into one the children of God scattered abroad in all the world, and ages thereof; is the end of his death, Joh. 11. 52.*

And the Sacrament is to be observed in remembrance of this, by all in the Church that professe they hope to be saved by the merits of his death; which the unregenerate does whom we cannot exclude from being the sheep Christ dyed for; and therefore it's as proper and congruous for such to be put in mind of the death of Christ, by the Sacrament, for their spiritual good as others, regenerating grace being a blessing of the Covenant procured by the death of Christ, as well as salvation is.

Unto this Mr. Collins answers somewhat scabily,

1. *Restraining the benefits that come by the death of Christ, unto those only that have a lively hope, purifying themselves, as God is pure, &c.*

2. *He queries, How if such be ignorant of what Christ is, and did; how can such doe it in remembrance of him?*

3. *Or how if by bloudy Oaths and blasphemies profane his blood. How can they doe it in a practical remembrance of him?*

Answ.

That the unregenerate as such, have not a lively hope, &c. I grant, but that they have a warrantable hope, as professing the true Christian Religion, relying upon the mercy of God through the merits of Christs death, Christ being the right object of all hope; which is a good encouragement for such to use the means in hope of a blessing; forasmuch as not any man in special can exempt

exempt himself from the saving benefits of his death, whom they by the outward signs are put in minde of, every Sacrament.

As before he would not have them objects of the promises of first grace, because they have not faith to apply the promises, &c. So now he will have none to have any ground of hope to receive the saving benefits that are procured for sinners by the death of Christ, (which Sacraments represent) but those in the Church, that have a lively hope. Doth Mr. Collins think, that a man may have faith to apply the promise before he hath grace? Or doth he think those promises have no object? Or that any shall have grace to whom it is not promised in the Church? So likewise, if none but those that have a lively hope can receive benefit by the death of Christ; then it will follow,

1. That the first regenerating grace is not a benefit that flows from the death of Christ, except a man can have this lively hope before he be regenerate.

2. That regeneration, as it is a benefit of the death of Christ, belongs to none but regenerate persons that have a lively hope; and then we shall exclude the unregenerate from all benefit or hope by Christ; unless they can convert themselves; which they cannot; and so exclude them from the day of grace and mercy, and make them aliens

ans from the Common-wealth of *Israel*, strangers to the Covenant of promise, and without hope and God in the world; equal with the Pagan world; which upon grosse mistake he hath done all along in this present Controversie. But I hope enough hath been spoke to satisfie my Reader, as to that particular. And therefore the unregenerate being so much concerned in the benefits of the death of Christ, which Sacraments are remembrancers of, it's very meet and suitable they should partake of the signes, that are so much concerned in the thing represented and exhibited thereby. Unto his second I

Ans.

If they be so ignorant, they ought to be instructed better, which hath been spoken already. Hardly can any be excepted against for ignorance that are intelligent, if a Minister will doe his duty to instruct them in a plain familiar way.

And for such as are scandalous, they should be dealt withall in a regular way, for their amendment, that their actual miscarriages indulged doe not leaven the whole, and hinder the blessing of every Ordinance from themselves. And although a practical remembrance may be desired of all; yet in the visible Church we shall alwayes meet with many loose carnal wretched sinners, that will offend scandalously, and so abuse the grace of Gospel Ordinances to their utter ruine, if the Lord prevent it not by giving them

them his grace to repent. The Sacrament is a means to ingage unto amendment, as proper as any other Ordinance, untill they be juridically cast out. Nothing else can disoblige them from duties of publick worship, as the Sacrament is. I confesse it is a sad and a lamentable condition, that such wretched miserable persons are in, that wofully abuse the Grace of the Gospel, and make such desperate returns for such exceeding rich grace and mercy, abusing the patience and long-suffering of God which should lead to repentance. How dare any profane persons bear up themselves upon the name of the Lord, and hope they shall be saved by Jesus Christ, and yet live in licentious courses, and hate instruction, and will not have Christ to rule over them by his Word and Scepter! Why, consider this, yea that forget God, lest he tear you in peices, and there be none to deliver; doe not flatter your selves the more because you are in the visible Church; for so long as you are but chaffe and tares, you are lyable every moment to be pluckt up and burnt in unquenchable flames. What though thou mayst escape the censures of the Church, be sure thou shall not escape the judgement of God, if thou continnest thy rebellion against him. It may be thou art spared for the sake of some precious wheat of Gods Elect, whom he will cause to spring out of thy roots, though a wicked tare thy self,

self, and thy ancestors before thee. Remember *Judas* that desperate Traytor, and son of perdition that was false to the Lord Jesus: his false heart and unworthy actions to his Lord whom he religiously professed, made him swell untill he burst asunder, and all his bowels gushed out. If thou wilt swear, blaspheme, be drunk, and scoffe at godlinesse, and live an idle filthy voluptuous life, and yet hope to be saved by Christ, and professest thy self a Christian; it may be thou hadst as good have been that *Judas*, as such a wretch as thou art, adding obstinacy unto thy former rebellion, untill the wrath of the Lord and his jealousie smoake against thee, bringing all the plagues written in his Book upon thee, and blot out thy name from under heaven. Either doe what in thee lies to walk up to thy profession of the true Religion that Sacraments oblige thee unto; or else be sure thy profession will rather aggravate thy abominable doings, and sink thee deeper in the bottomelesse pit, then be any plea for thee at the Judgement seat of Jesus Christ: for he will say unto all such false hearted profane Christians at the last, *Depart from me ye workers of iniquity, &c.*

3. In the next place we come to the Sacramental Actions, he says, *I have argued learnedly, when I say the unregenerate have a hand to take, and a mouth to eat, which the reverent Doctor denied, because they have not faith,*

&c. I desired him to prove that faith was that hand, but Mr. Collins hath prevented him, and given his proof of it in *John* 6. 54, 53, 56. compared with *vers.* 40. 35, 50. *Ephes.* 4. 17. *Joh.* 3. 36.

The 6. of *John* doth prove, that a sincere saving faith in the person of Christ is of absolute necessity unto salvation. Christ is the bread of life, which came down from heaven to give life unto the dead world: he that believes in him shall never hunger and thirst more, but shall have everlasting life, and be raised up at the last day. And the very humane body of Christ, as consisting of flesh and blood, without which he could not have been made a perfect Sacrifice for sin, nor satisfied the justice of God for mankind that had sinned; was this bread of God, which whosoever believed not, hath no part in. But what is this to prove that faith is the only hand to receive the outward signs of the body and blood of our Lord? Doth it follow that the same faith is as necessary to receive an outward sign, as the benefits that come by Christ unto salvation? This chapter proves no such thing, it having no reference at all to the Sacrament of the holy Supper: for these words were spoken long before the Sacrament of the Supper was instituted and ordained. I hope the real flesh and blood of Christs humane body is not to be received under the forms of bread and wine; nor indeed

Answ.

deed at all, for it's the Spirit of Christ that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words of Christ unto his, they are Spirit, and life. I am sorry the Papists should see our Divines applying this 6. of *John* to the Sacrament.

I say still as before, that taking and eating are bodily actions, and to be understood according to the rules of institution, which the unregenerate Christians are capable to do, and act as well as any. And it remains still to prove, by *Mr. Collins* favour, that take and eat, &c. is meant of faith to be the hand and mouth to take and eat with; his quotations are drawn too much awry to speak his opinion. I must demand further proof, or else he will not clear the thing I am sure.

1. I grant that unto actual receiving of the signes, there should be in every one both a knowing and a believing that Christs blood were shed for many, for remission of sins, and that themselves take and eat the outward elements of bread and wine in that remembrance, in hope that they are of that number which Christ laid down his life for.

2. I grant it necessary, that every one that comes to the Lords Table, come in the warranty of faith, and to be fully perswaded of the lawfulness of their own receiving, for *whatsoever is not of faith is sin*. And hence all the Church as professing themselves Christs subjects, must plead for their warranty.

ranty Christs command, *Doe this in remembrance of him.*

I grant it good and lawful for them that truly can, in the act of receiving, to exercise an act of faith in appropriating and applying the true, real, spiritual bread of life, Jesus Christ himself, with all the saving benefits of his death unto their souls; but yet I deny that this is of necessity required of all that come thither to serve Christ in his own Ordinance. 3.

I grant that the outward signes are holy in a relative sense, as respecting their end, and so are objects of faith, and of the minde: but as they are signs simply and elementary, they are only objects of the outward senses, and not of faith properly. 4.

I grant that the Sacraments are of singular use, for the encrease and growth in grace of the most eminent Christians in the Church; and yet have their special use for the weakest babes in the Church, for knowledge and Christian obedience, even the worst of members (as it is Gods Ordinance) may receive good by it where God is pleased to give his blessing, as in all his other Ordinances set up in his Church for the spiritual good thereof. 5.

Mr. Collins had thought the taking, eating, and drinking the outward signs must be spiritual by faith, he sayes.

I think there is but few of his minde in this: *Ans.*

this: for certainly nothing more clear then that to take, eat and drink of the signs is natural and bodily, which is necessary to be done, by every one from the words of institution. And as they are elements or creature fit to eat and drink, they are properly objects of the outward senses, and not of faith, as I said before, which natural actions are appointed unto a spiritual end, which end requires the exercise of the minde, memory, heart and conscience, faith in Christ being supposed in all that are baptized and admitted thither, I mean a profession of faith in him that can save by Jesus Christ at least. And how Mr. Collins can prove, that all the actions about giving and receiving must be spiritual by faith I know not, ulesse he can tell how to make a Sacrament of every action about the Sacramental administration; the which to doe will finde him some work. Let him prove, that take, and eat, is a sign of our spiritual taking and eating by faith, which is more easie to be proved then the other, that to take and eat must be spiritual by faith: for then all natural actions are needlesse, if faith be all that is meant. And if those actions be significant, and instruct the receiver to receive Christ by a particular applicatory act of faith, I hope the unregenerate have as much need to be taught and encouraged unto this by the Sacrament as any. I know no incongruity in this.

I said in my Book, pag. 38, 39. *The language of the Sacrament was in general and indefinite terms. This cup is the New Testament in my blood, shed for many for remission of sins, &c.* Mr. Collins asks, *who those many are?* and answers himself, and saith, *disciples of Christ.*

It's true, Christ's Disciples are of those many Christ shed his blood for. And what doth Mr. Collins conceive of Church-members baptized, and not excommunicate? Are not they Christ's disciples? if not, let him prove them Infidels if he can. Answ. 1.

When the Lord Jesus said he shed his blood for many, he means not only his disciples in present being, that are called and sanctified, but the whole number of his elect in all ages and places of the world, for remission of sins, and the Sacramental cup, is a token and seal thereof, to be received at all times by the Church in that remembrance. And I doubt not but Christ has a great number of his Elect alwayes of the unregenerate in the Church. What incongruity in all this? 2.

Besides, some other things, I said, *It sounds very harsh in the Church, to exclude this Ordinance of Christ from being a means of converting the unregenerate in the Church, they being the most proper objects of converting grace, as held out in the promises, for the putting of which into execution, all the Ordinances in the Church seeme to be subservient.*

And I verily believe, this Ordinance of

the holy Supper, had never been denyed to convert in the Church, had not Divines run themselves upon such great mistake about habitual unworthinesse from 1 Cor. 11. That very mistake hath occasioned this : for if the unregenerate eat and drink unworthily as the *Corinths* did, and were punished for, of necessity then it were rational to deny it a converting Ordinance : for as the Reverent Doctor argues rationally from that, thus, *Natural men are guilty of the bloud of Christ, and eat and drink judgement to themselves, and shall not think, that that sinful act in unworthy receiving shall be so best of God, as to become a means of conversion to them, &c.* This must needs be a consequence of the other mistake, That being removed, men will easily yeeld the other. Mr. *Collins* tells us of twenty arguments of Mr. *Gillespy*, that it is not for conversion, the which he sayes, I have not yet answered. I must confesse it; neither doe I know what they are, for I have not his Book. My friend Mr. *Humsfrey* hath promised to answer those arguments : Which I believe will be easie enough to doe, unlesse they be stronger then the strongest of Mr. *Collins* in his answer to Mr. *Barsdale*, upon the same argument, pag. 14. the latter end of his Book, the which argument of his I shall examine anon. Let us first see what he hath excepted against mine. Which I think are so much for the probability of the affirmative, that the negative

gative must remain doubtful, unto the impartial intelligent Reader.

That one special end of the work of the Ministry in general, is for conversion of the unregenerate in the Church, will hardly be denied. 1.

But to the administration of the Sacrament the main essentials of that work of the Ministry in the Church are of necessity, as Word, and Prayer, and breaking of Bread, *Act. 2. 42.* Therefore one special end of the Sacrament, as it is an essential part of that work, is for the converting the unregenerate in the Church.

The major proposition is bottomed from *Ephes. 4. 8, 10, 11, 12, 13* verses. *Christ ascended far above the heavens, that he might fill all things. And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers; for the gathering of Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come into the union of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man; unto the measure of the stature of the fulnesse of Christ.*

1. Here it is plain that God hath ordained the work of the Ministry in the hands of Pastors and Teachers in the Church, to edifie the body of Christ, untill the whole number of his elect be united to him, and made compleat, &c. And we know there is alwayes in the Church, objects of con-

version as well as of the promises, to which the work of the Ministry is intended to unite them unto Christ, &c.

And this is to be done by the work of the Ministry in general, without any distinction of parts, the whole work together without exception of any part, is for conversion in the Church, as is clear from this place. Now unlesse Mr. Collins, or any other what ever, can give us some clear Scripture to exclude part of this work from that end of conversion, they must allow this end of conversion to the work of the Ministry in general, but as that was never performed as yet, so I think never will by any: only men take the boldness to separate that which the holy Ghost doth joyn together, upon meer mistake about unworthy receiving.

And it is a rule that Mr. Collins doth justify from Matth. 7. 6. *Where the Scriptures do not distinguish, we must not distinguish.* If a principal end of the work of the Ministry in the Church be intended for conversion in general, then the particular parts of that work; for the particulars are included in the general. And the most comprehensive sense is to be taken of all Scripture-expressions, unlesse some other Scriptures put some limitations of that sense; and when any man can shew me a Scripture that excludes the administration of the Sacrament, from this principal end of conversion in the Church, I will have

have done with this Argument. And untill then, the Argument is of more force then all the authority of men (meerly) can in the least overthrow. We should distinguish of preaching the Gospel unto Pagans, that are aliens to the Common-wealth of *Israel*; and of the work of the Ministry consisting of the whole administration of the Gospel, intended only for the spiritual good of the visible Church of Christ: unto Infidels the preaching of the Gospel is appointed the ordinary way and means to convert them unto the faith, and bring them into the Church; but those that are in the Church as they are objects of the promises, and under the obligation of all observances, which Infidels are not, so they are under greater advantages of converting them unto sincerity of faith, and the power of godliness by the work of the Ministry in general, of which Infidels are allowed but a part.

The minor proposition is evident, that to the administration of the Sacrament, it's necessary that the main essentials of the work of the Ministry in the Church be performed, as publishing not only the Word of institution, but the History of Christs death and passion, with exhortations suitable to the Ordinance in hand, according to the practise and custom of our own Church, with solemn prayers and praises considerably meet for so weighty an Ordinance; unto which are

adjoyned instituted signes to be given and taken in remembrance of the death of Christ; all which concurring together in the act of administration, doth comprise upon the matter the main essentials of publick worship, wherein the work of the Ministry doth chiefly consist; so that I cannot conceive how the premises can be denied by any: therefore the conclusion doth necessarily follow, That the Sacrament, as it is an essential part of the work of the Ministry, is for conversion in the Church.

But Mr. Collins saith, *This argument is worth nothing.* But why did he not shew the weakness of it then, his bare say so is no answer. But he sayes, *Let it be proved that therefore Christ hath appointed it for conversion; if it were, doubtlesse the excommunicate should not be debarred.*

Answ. I. I have made good the premises, the conclusion needs no proof. If the same instruments of the Spirit unto conversion be in the administration of the Sacrament, as at the other parts of the Ministerial work in the Church, then we must allow the same effect to the one as to the other, both being the Ordinance of God, and performed by persons in the Office and Function of the Ministry.

But in the administration of the Sacrament, are the same instruments of the Spirit, unto conversion, as Word, Prayer, &c.

There-

Therefore the Sacrament is appointed for conversion in the Church.

Whereas he sayes, *Then doubtlesse the ex-communicate should not be debarred*, it is no consequence, because converting of sinners, is not all the ground why God commands his Church to observe all things of his prescribing, but his own glory, in commanding what he will, because he will: Besides,

2. The excommunicate should be put out of all Church Communion in all other parts of publick worship, as well as from the Sacrament, as I have made it out in my answer unto Doctor Drake, which is not yet answered by any. Bar removed, pag. 70, 71, 72, 73.

3. This implies that the unregenerate are not to doe any thing by way of duty, but what is for conversion, not be diligent in their callings, shew mercy, and doe justly, &c. because these duties are not appointed to convert them.

Next, all men confesse that the Word and Prayer, as they are publick Ordinances of God, are for conversion in the Church.

But without the Word and Prayer sanctifying, and setting apart the elements of Bread and Wine, there can be no Sacrament.

Therefore the Sacrament, as consisting in Word and Prayer, is converting.

This Mr. Collins tearms, *A thread-bare argu-*

ment that hath a great hole in it. For though the Word and Prayer are means of conversion, and they doe constantly attend the Sacrament, yet it doth not follow, that the Sacrament *quà* Sacrament is so; nor is there any need for conversion, that the unregenerate should be at it, for they may hear, and pray, and not receive.

Why did not Mr. Collins really discover a hole in the argument by some solid answer, but fancy a hole before it be made: he confesses the Word and Prayer are means of conversion, and so grants my major: and upon the matter grants my minor, by saying, that Word and Prayer doe constantly attend the Sacrament, but yet he is not willing to yeeld the conclusion; which is not very rational, I concluding no more then what he grants in the propositions. But he saith, *It will not follow, that the Sacrament quà a Sacrament is converting*; either he must mean, that the giving and receiving without word and Prayer, is the Sacrament, *quà a Sacrament*, or that giving and receiving the signes, in relation to Word & Prayer conjoyned, is the Sacrament, *quà a Sacrament*. If he means the former, let him prove that giving and receiving the signes of Bread and Wine without Word and Prayer is the Sacrament. If the latter, then in his granting the premises he yeilds the conclusion, and thus you may quickly see what a great hole he hath made in this argument.

But

But then he saith, *Nor is there any need for conversion, that the unregenerate should be at it, for they may pray, and hear, and not receive.*

No! is there no great need of converting the unregenerate? I had thought they have great need to take the advantage of every Ordinance in the Church, appointed for their spiritual good, and in order to conversion. And have not they as much need to enjoy the benefit of instituted signes, conjoynd to the Word and Prayer, to represent the death and passion of Jesus Christ unto the outward senses, which are the inlets to the understanding, heart and conscience, as any others? But then he sayes, *They may hear, and pray, and not receive.* It's true, (so may any other) doth it therefore follow, that none may receive? or that hearing and praying in order to receiving, is sufficient without taking, and eating and drinking the institute signes in remembrance of the death of Christ? Or would he have them to hear and pray, in order to receiving, and then turn their backs upon Gods holy Ordinance, after they have prayed unto God for his blessing upon it? The Reverend Doctor said, *That presence might answer this end, unto which I answered, If bare presence, much more actual receiving.* But now Mr. Collins sayes, *That they cannot promise them, that their presence will do them good, but they are sure, he saith, their receiving will not. And hence concludes my consequence is naught.* Who

Who can promise before-hand, that any other Ordinance in the Church shall doe the unregenerate good by their presence at the time, shall they not therefore give their presence? It's the language of Scripture, that all in the Church are to keep Gods statutes and judgements for their 'good.

But *he is sure their receiving will doe them no good.* I wonder how he dare limit the holy One, and detract so injuriously from the wisdom, power, and grace of Christ in his own appointments. He hath confessed before, that the Sacraments were instituted for the spiritual good of the visible Church of Christ in general, and that this Church consists of good and bad; and now he sayes the Sacrament wil doe the unregenerate no good. Doth he think the unregenerate are not of the visible Church, that Sacraments were instituted for the good thereof? The judicious Reader may easily discern how consonant he is to his own judgement, in more things then this.

But this antecedent of his, *That he is sure their receiving will doe them no good,* is sufficient to publish to the world, that my consequence is naught, &c. in answer to the Doctor.

But why doth Mr. *Collins* give us his argument for the negative? He turns me over to Mr. *Gillespy*, that hath twenty arguments. I suppose himself may use some of them in
his

his answer to Mr. *Barksdales* 9. argument, wherein he seemes to make a shew of silencing all men, that hold the Sacrament a converting Ordinance, pag. 14. And because the argument which he answers unto, is the same with mine, I shall crave leave of Mr. *Barksdale*, to examine in brief the strength of his, because he thinks he hath done enough at once to shew the vanity of our opinion.

1. He argues from the absurdities that will follow: Then it is as proper to go to the Heathen and call them to a Sacrament, in order to their conversion, as to preach the Gospel unto them.

It concerns Mr. *Collins* to prove that every Ordinance in the Church instituted for the good thereof, doth belong unto Heathen and such, and may be used for their good. *Ans. 1.*

Let him prove that the unbaptized Heathen are as much in Covenant relation, and under the obligation of all Christian observance, as the unregenerate Christian. 2.

Let him prove that whatsoever is for conversion in the Church, is for the good of Heathens as well as preaching the Gospel. The exercise of discipline is for converting an offending brother, doth it follow that Church discipline is to convert Heathens, to whom it never was intended or appointed? Besides, we know the unbaptized is not to eat thereof; were there the like ground to the 3.

the unregenerate Christian, I should be satisfied. Thus you may see even in the very thing wherein he would charge absurdity upon us, it will return upon himself, by putting no difference between the Church of Christ, and the Infidel world.

2. He says, *If the Sacrament be a converting Ordinance, there can be no personal unworthinesse sufficient to debar any from it, then come Turks, Indians, Papists, excommunicate persons, &c.*

Ans. This is but the same again in other words, which I have answered again and again all along: here is a plain levelling the Church with the world again, as if the same personal unworthinesse were in the Church as is in the world; doth it follow that because no personal unworthinesse in the Church is sufficient to debar any from the Sacrament, but only actual, persisted in unto excommunication, that therefore there is no personal unworthinesse in the unclean Pagan world, that lies in unbelief? They must first receive the Doctrine of the Gospel, before they can be brought into the Church where the Sacraments are to be administred. And as for those that are in Covenant-relation, and in possession of Church-membership, it's true, personal unworthinesse can be no bar, because in a relative sense, there is no such thing in the Church: but I have said enough to this already.

3. He saith, *If it be a converting Ordinance,*
be

he can see no reason why the Communicant should be bound to examine himself, and so eat, or whether he hath skill to discern the Lords body.

The Word and Prayer are converting Ordinances, and yet he may see reason enough to urge upon such, preparation, and caution, prerequisite and concomitant in those duties of hearing and praying, (if he examine the Scriptures) in order to a blessing; the same may be said of the Sacrament, if Mr. Collins be not too perverse.

Answ.

But then he comes to speak distinctly to the argument.

He distinguisheth between converting by accident, or by institution designed unto that end, in an Ordinance; hearing of the Word is such, faith comes by hearing, Rom. 10. Hear and your soul shall live, let any shew us a Scripture speaking to this purpose concerning the Lords Supper.

1.

'Tis true, faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. But doth it follow that all other Ordinances are excluded from being a means of working sincere faith in the Church, when they are joyned with the Word in the work of the Ministry, as hath been said already? That of Rom. 10. proves, that it is not possible that any should call upon the name of the Lord in whom they have not beleived. And how should they believe in him, of whom they have not (so much as) heard of? And how shall they hear

Answ.

hear without a Preacher, &c. which is spoken to the case of Heathens that never heard of Christ. Such must of necessity hear Christ, before they can believe in him. And this faith comes by hearing, and this hearing by the Word of God, by a Preacher sent. This was the ordinary means of bringing persons into the Church, that were Pagans born; and then being within, they had the benefit of all other Ordinances in the Church, for their edification and salvation. What then, will it follow hence, that persons born in the Church, that draw in the knowledge of Christ by education and tradition in their youth, cannot believe or have faith in any other way but by hearing only? The promise is, that *whosoever shall call upon the Name of the Lord shall be saved*, in opposition to those that never heard of his Name. Salvation is of the Christian Church, as once of the *Jews*, unto which promise of Salvation all the Ordinances set up in the Church are subservient.

The work of the Ministry was to be carried on by the Pastors and Teachers fixed unto their several flocks in the Church, which they are constantly to attend upon for the spiritual good thereof; as they which must give an account thereof unto their Lord; and it concerns them faithfully to carry on the whole work of their Ministry accordingly towards their whole flock, and not to make

Her-

Heathens of them, & then content themselves onely with preaching unto them on the Lords day, and the work is done, as if there were no more care to be taken with Church-members, then with Pagans, nor no more means to be used for their spiritual good then they would use unto Heathen, whom the work of the Ministry was never intended for. And whereas Mr. Collins calls for proof, *Where are the like Scriptures to prove the Sacrament a converting Ordinance, as is preaching and hearing?* I answer him by distinguishing thus, hearing of faith preached was and is the ordinary means of sincere believing in the Church, of which the Sacrament is a special part. Besides, the Sacrament cannot be administered without hearing the Word of God, and prayer, with the use of other senses, as it is the visible compendium of the whole Gospel holding forth Christ crucified for remission of sins.

But to speak a little unto his other quotation, *Isai. 55. Hear and your souls shall live.* This was spoken unto the Church he will say; I grant it was, and more then this too, as that chapter shews. That first they were invited to come unto God in whom all spiritual blessing was to be had, for the satisfying of every empty thirsty soul; and dissuaded from thinking to be satisfied elsewhere. Secondly, exhorted unto several duties.

I. To

1. To hearken diligently unto what the Lord had said unto them, and be satisfied with good.

Then 2. incline your ear and come unto me, that you may be satisfied with the farnesse of my house; They were to hear, and come to God too in all holy obedience; for in the Scriptures men are said not to hear; when they will not regard to doe what the Lord hath commanded them, so hear that your souls may live, hear and doe is the language of the holy Ghost to the Church usually.

3. Then to seek God while he will be found, and to call upon him while he is neer, seek him in all his own appointments and Ordinances, where he hath promised his presence.

4. Then is subjoyned, *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, And let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy on him, &c.* Therefore you may easily conceive here is not only hear, and your soul shall live, but all other duties of worship and observance are required also in the Church, in order to a blessing of spiritual life, and there are promises of grace and mercy unto the Church in that same chapter upon their doing their duties enjoyned: the which doth make good the distinction above; We know in the Church, Not the bearers of the Word, but the doers thereof shall be blessed.

blest in their deed; persons in the Church are bound to observe and doe all that Christ in his Word hath commanded; upon that account they have the promise of his gracious presence; and if the Sacrament be an Ordinance of Christ for the good of his Church; why may we not expect the presence of Christ, in blessing this for the spiritual good of his Church as all the rest? Mr. Collins must give stronger reasons to deny it a converting Ordinance then these, or else he had better have said nothing: me thinks Mr. Gillespie might have furnished him with a greater strength then so.

Next he saith, *Either the Word alone (read at the administration) is to convert, or Word and signes making up the Sacrament; if the Word only, he thinks wicked men may stay and hear that, if we say more, we must prove it.*

This, as it is no argument to prove the negative, so it need not be answered: for his main thing in this, is to bid us prove that the Sacrament is a converting Ordinance in the Church: the which I conceive is clearly done already. And when Mr. Collins is able to exclude the Sacrament from the work of the Ministry in the Church; and exclude Word and Prayer in order to the Sacrament from that work, (and end of converting) in the Church; and can exclude this Ordinance, from being a spiritual instrument in the hand of the Spirit of Christ to

Ans.

L

quicken

quicken whom he will, and can exclude the unregenerate from Covenant relation, and membership, and allow them no other privilege in the Church for their spiritual good, then unto Infidels, &c. I say, when he hath performed this task soundly and substantially; it's possible he may make the vanity of our opinion (that are for the affirmative) to appear, and put us upon further proof: untill then let the Judicious Reader judge of the arguments between us, whether ours or his be most rational and satisfactory; as they are deducted from general rules of Scripture and reason. And by this time I have given you an account of all that Mr. Collins hath excepted against the first part of my book. I doe not know of any material thing I have omitted to answer in particular: but indeed not so much for any great cause I had thus to doe, in what he hath said to loosen the foundations and principles upon which my whole building stands, but from a desire further to clear up the thing in controversie, and to reduce the controversie into a narrower compasse.

In the close of Mr. Collins answer, he collecteth about seven rotten pillars, as he calls them, out of the whole of mine, and pens them down as he pleaseth, and then bids others judge of them, taking it for granted that he hath discovered them to be rotten and false, And that my Book hath not much truth in any one page of it.

It's possible that there may be some things *Answ. 1.*
in my Book, that are doubtful, and that
upon the piercing tryal of some grave Di-
vines of deeper Judgements, may be disco-
vered unsound or rendered weak; but I am
confident that Mr. *Collins* hath made no such
discovery in any one thing that he hath ex-
cepted against.

I humbly conceive, that whosoever un-
dertakes to answer the main grounds and
principles I build upon for free admission to
the Sacrament, they must deny our Church
and Baptism, or else destroy themselves by
their own inconsistencies, let their parts be
what they will. And I wonder that any of
the Presbyterian judgement, should contend
with me, for they doe but discover their
own nakednesse, and give occasion unto
Brownists and Anabaptists to reproach us; so
that I professe I am afraid to speak what I
should in some things.

I shall give you a breviat of the princi-
ples I build upon in the managing of this in
controversie.

That the Eternal God hath created all
mankinde for himself, and hath decreed
the blessed and everlasting happinesse of
some, with all the wayes and means for
that end, with his eternal purpose not to
give special grace unto the rest, but in his
wisdome and providence, doth so order and
dispose of the means effectually, in respect of

sin and the punishment thereof, to the infinite glory of his Justice, in the just condemnation of the wicked world.

2. That for the Elects sake, Christ was promised after the fall, and came into the world, as the only means of Gods putting into execution his eternal purposes concerning their salvation, the whole creation and race of mankind is preserved successively in their generations, for the being and gathering of Gods Elect unto grace and glory.

3. That Jesus Christ is the only meriting and procuring cause of the Gospel Covenant, freely made and published unto some of mankind, of free choice.

4. That this Covenant of grace, is of a large comprehensive extent, including the parents, and their children in their generations for ever, to them that have entred into it by profession and baptism, and doe not renounce it, or apostate from it.

5. That the Covenant of Grace consists in promises of giving the first regenerating grace.

Secondly, in promises of groweth in grace.

Thirdly, In promises of rewarding graces with comfortable blessings temporal and spiritual in this life, and with eternal glory in the world to come.

6. That the Church of God on earth, is constituted by the will and pleasure of God, that in it might alwayes be fitable objects of

those

those different promises included in the Gospel Covenant, unto which the natural issue of Christians in the visible Church doth well agree.

That Sacraments, as they represent the death of Christ, are seals confirming the truth of the whole Covenant of grace made and published to the visible Church only. 7.

That Sacraments are instituted and intended only for the Churches use, in order to the spiritual good thereof in general, which includes the use of every one in particular. 8.

That all in the Church come under the the obligation of all instituted worship prescribed, of which Sacraments are a principal part. 9.

That Covenant relation is either personal, or parental; the former founded upon profession of faith and holy baptism, the later derived really and wholly by succession. 10.

That a positive profession of faith explicitly is necessary unto admission unto Church-membership of those that are Heathens born, but Church-membership is the birth privilege of all born of Christian parents in the Church. 11.

That to be Saints, Believers, Disciples, a Brother, and within, is understood by Church-membership. 12.

That during the state of Church-membership, every member ought to enjoy the external 13.

ternal priviledges of that Church, whereof he is a member in particular, untill he voluntarily fall away by final apostasie, or be justly cast out of all Church Communion by an authoritative act of Church censures.

14.

That those that derive their Church-membership from that great Charter of Covenant relation with the Church, and have it confirmed by the authority of the Church, baptizing them as members of the visible body of Christ, cannot be legally put out of Church communion, at the pleasure of some few Elders of themselves, *unlesse deligated so to act from a National Assembly of Presbyters.

15.

Though the right of discipline may be inherent in every lawful Presbyter, yet the exercise thereof is proper only unto those that are intrusted therewith by the representatives of the whole.

16.

Irregular actings and good ends cannot stand together; to doe evil that good may come, is not only dangerous but damnable.

17.

The state of unregeneracy and personal unworthinesse in the Church doth not bar any one from the Sacrament, nor doth come within the verge of the Church to judge of or correct in the least.

18.

Actual unworthinesse persisted in unto obstinacy, is the only object of Church censures

tures of persons in the Church; yet all actual unworthinesse doth not necessarily run persons upon eating and drinking the Lords Supper unworthily, in the Apostles sense.

There is no personal unworthinesse in the Church, in a relative sense, in reference to the Sacrament, or any uther Ordinance, but the carelesse neglect thereof is most unworthy and punishable.

Not to discern the Lords Body, is, not to put a difference between common bread and the instituted signes, set a part by Word and Prayer, to represent the death of Christ for remission of sins.

Examination is a private duty to be performed between God and the conscience unto a profitable receiving, having a special eye to the rules of the whole administration, making their approaches there accordingly, externally at least.

There is a real difference to be put between the unregenerate Christian, and an unregenerate Infidel, the Church and the world, believer and unbeliever; the confounding of these hath run us into Brownism of late.

The whole Church is in Covenant with God, and are the immediate objects of the promises; but the world lies in wickednesse, and under wrath, without the promises of the Covenant, and hope and God in the world.

24. The whole Church are under all Gospel observance, the whole work of the Ministry as the ordinary means of their conversion and salvation; The Pagan world for the most part never had the advantage of so much as any part of that work, the Gospel being hid to them that perish.
25. Salvation is of the Christian Church, but no salvation out of it. *How can they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how can they believe in him of whom they have not heard?* And there is salvation in no other Name, whatsoever, save only in Jesus Christ.
26. That the legally unclean were not so much debarred the benefit of the Passeeover, as other Sacrifices or spiritual observances in that Church.
27. That the Moral uncleanness then, was no more bar to the Passeeover, then unto all other observances in the Church. Nay that was either punished by the Judges, according unto their Judicial proceedings, or otherwise cleansed from it, by a continual course of Sacrifices. And therefore no bar at all against any.
28. That no persons in the Church of the Old Testament, or in the Churches of the New, read of in Scriptures, were ever debarred the Passeeover, or the Sacrament of the holy Supper, and allowed the benefit of all the other Ordinances in the Church. Hence I cannot but conceive that

that suspension from the Sacrament alone, usually called the minor Excommunication, is but a humane invention in the Church.

More is required to the Lords Supper then to Baptism in the Church, yet lesse is required to the holy Supper of them that are Church-members, then of Heathens unto Baptism.

29.

We must distinguish of real and relative personal worthinesse, The whole visible Church not under Church censures are personally worthy in a relative sense. And hence there is no personal unworthinesse in the Church,

30.

2. Of believing in a large sense, and of believing in a strict sense; both to be accounted true believers in Scripture sense; The denomination of a Believer is as well derived from a right object believed on, as from the right and holinesse of the Subject believing.

3. Of entring into the Covenant, and of continuing in the Covenant. The former is proper for Infidels: the latter concerns the Church; for it is supposed that all in the Church have entred the Gospel Covenant. And in the Church we must distinguish of transgressing the Covenant, and renouncing the Covenant, of breaking, and renewing it; and whosoever is entred into the Covenant, comes under the whole administration

tion thereof, and cannot be disobliged from any observance thereof, but by the binding power of the Keys of Christs Kingdome exercised Juridically.

Beloved Friends, I have now given you an account of the most of my principles that I build upon, and conclude free admission to the holy Supper from. And I judge they are such that have their rise from the holy Scriptures; or are rational deductions drawn from thence, which are not in the least loosened nor shaken by Mr. *Collins*, nor any other of his judgement; nor I think never will, notwithstanding his forwardnesse of spirit in the close of his Book, to cry up a victory, when he has not so much as routed me in any one thing in all my Book, which argues a bold conceited vapouring spirit a little too much.

Therefore now in short, I shall collect some of his main strength and magisterial principles made use of to undermine the foundations of mine, either exprest or implied.

1. He denies that Church-membership alone doth give a full right to the Sacrament, therefore superaddes knowledge, faith, and the fruits of holinesse to give one right: all which say I is included in Membership. And his superadding will give a Pagan right.

2. He affirms that he looks upon all Church-members habitually worthy from their interest

terest in Christ, until they discover the contrary by their actual offendings.

Then say I, he holds, That all Infants are habitually worthy from their Interest in Christ, and commonly fall away from that state of grace.

He sayes, 'Tis not much material, whether the *Corinths* were punished for habitual unworthinellse or no, and yet upon the matter, that the whole he disputes against.

He saith the unregenerate are personally unworthy, and therefore cannot receive.

He sayes there is no promise belongs to the unregenerate in the Church, that have not faith to apply it; and that they are rather objects of the first grace, then of the promise of that grace; and that the Heathen are as much objects of the promise of first grace as the unregenerate part of the Church. And doubts whether any promise belong to men as unregenerate; if so, then Heathen may come to the Sacrament.

He puts no difference between the unregenerate in the Church and the Pagan world, in respect of promises, titles, duties, privileges, except it be the baptizing their children: he undisciples them, undoties them, uncovenants them, in reference to the holy Supper, and yet will have them Church-members, and present their children unto baptism.

He sayes, That Sacraments are strong meat

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

meat, which weak Christians are not able to digest, and that they are seals of faith only.

8. He denies the Sacrament to be a converting Ordinance, because then Heathens should come, &c. And will not have the unregenerate Christians to come under any duty, but what is converting.

9. He affirms that in an unlearned Congregation, a single Minister may suspend from the Sacrament, he being the ruling part of the Church, &c. And yet in all other things seeme to bear himself much upon the authority of men. With such like things as these he thinks he hath loosened all that I have built upon, and hence thinks that the whole will fall; but he must take a great deal of pains more then yet he hath done, if he think to be the man that must give satisfaction in this Controversie. And I believe he must speak a great deal more then hath been spoken by any, if in the least he can make good suspension from the Sacrament, more then from any other part of holy Communion in sacred worship, I mean of Church-members of years of discretion, as the question is stated. He must not think that the authority of men will carry the thing, it being a businesse of this consequence, that on which the peace and settlement depends; which can never be as to our condition, so long as men make habitual worthinesse in a real sense, that which

which alone gives one right to the Sacrament. 2. And set up the distinction of Believer and Infidel in the Church. 3. And level the unregenerate part of the Church with the world in respect of Covenant relation, promises of first grace, work of the Ministry, seals of the Covenant, &c. Such like interferences in a visible Church doth destroy it, and pluck up the very foundation on which the Church of *England* stands. My constant prayer to the Lord is, and shall be, that he will so favour us with the blessings of his people, as to give us Magistrates and Ministers, that may be tender in protecting and defending the Vine which himself hath planted. And it's pity that Mr. *Collins* and divers others of his judgement should not see where truth and the Churches peace lyes.

I have done with him, as to what he hath excepted against my Book in particular; I shall very briefly examine his strength for Suspension from the Lords Supper.

FINIS.

1871

1. The first of the year was a very cold day.
2. The second day was a very cold day.
3. The third day was a very cold day.
4. The fourth day was a very cold day.
5. The fifth day was a very cold day.
6. The sixth day was a very cold day.
7. The seventh day was a very cold day.
8. The eighth day was a very cold day.
9. The ninth day was a very cold day.
10. The tenth day was a very cold day.
11. The eleventh day was a very cold day.
12. The twelfth day was a very cold day.
13. The thirteenth day was a very cold day.
14. The fourteenth day was a very cold day.
15. The fifteenth day was a very cold day.
16. The sixteenth day was a very cold day.
17. The seventeenth day was a very cold day.
18. The eighteenth day was a very cold day.
19. The nineteenth day was a very cold day.
20. The twentieth day was a very cold day.
21. The twenty-first day was a very cold day.
22. The twenty-second day was a very cold day.
23. The twenty-third day was a very cold day.
24. The twenty-fourth day was a very cold day.
25. The twenty-fifth day was a very cold day.
26. The twenty-sixth day was a very cold day.
27. The twenty-seventh day was a very cold day.
28. The twenty-eighth day was a very cold day.
29. The twenty-ninth day was a very cold day.
30. The thirtieth day was a very cold day.
31. The thirty-first day was a very cold day.

I shall in the next place annex a short Answer to, or an Examination of Mr. Collins Quotations and Arguments for that which he calls *A Juridical Suspension from the Lords Supper*, the main Subject of his late Book.

Beloved Friends, I am sorry that our Author should take such a deal of pains, to make good that thing that hath, and doth so much trouble and hinder the edification and peace of the Church; and hath been the occasion of the extirpation of the Churches Discipline; and the main impediment of an establishment of Discipline at the present. And how impossible it is, that the Church of *England* should be preserved and secured in a Church state, from the common reproaches of adversaries upon his principles, let them
that

that are sober judge; when himself is equal-
ling the most of her members to the Infidel
world, disobliging them from duties of in-
stituted worship and observance, under this
pretence, that they are unbelievers, and no
disciples, nor brethren that are within; and
hence he will allow them just as much pri-
viledge in the Church, as he doth unto Pa-
gans; except baptizing their Infants, which
he will hardly doe upon their own parents
faith, but upon their remote predecessors.
And thus he makes a great stir about su-
spension from the Sacrament; and by this
groundlesse censure, doth hinder or make
invalid other necessary commands of Jesus
Christ, to the great prejudice of the Church
of Christ; As namely, the benefit of Gods
Ordinance of Sacrament, and just excom-
munications according to the practice of
Apostolical Churches, when this suspen-
sion was not known nor heard of. And
therefore I having spoke so much already
in defence of this priviledge and right of
a Church-member, and that being already
ingaged in this Controversie, give me leave
further to answer to what I can finde urged
against the friends of my judgement that
hath not as yet been spoken unto, as may
satisfie the plain minded Christian, that is
not able to unravel so many subtil needlesse
syllogisms, that Mr. Collins abounds with
in his elaborate Book. But I intend bre-
vity;

vity; And therefore expect not my answer unto every thing, but to his main grounds he hath laid for suspension.

In stating of the question Mr. Collins says;

1. As to suspending of some persons from the Supper; he means no more then a denial of that Ordinance from some, pag. 1. 4.

2. He distinguisheth of Suspension, To be either Juridical, or Pastoral, Positive, or Primitive.

3. Of a Presbytered Church he saith, They finding some of their members grossely ignorant or scandalous, not excommunicated in the Name of the Lord Jesus, are to warn them to forbear coming to the Lords Table for a time, and if they presse in to deny it them, declaring the Church hath no Communion with them, pag. 3.

I shall speak unto that suspension he calls *Answ. 1.* Juridical and Positive only; for if I can break him in the proof of that, his other will appear to be a dream. But to the question,

1. He saith, They mean no more by suspension then a denial of that Ordinance of the Supper from them, for a time.

Then 2. In case they will come, to deny it them, declaring the Church hath no communion with them.

Here you may take notice, how clear Mr. Collins is in stating the question.

1. He makes suspension no more but a denial of the Sacrament from some for a time.

M

And

And then secondly the Church declares they have no Communion with them: so that he in stating the question layes foundation for a Suspension, and Excommunication both: For if excommunication consists not in putting out of all Church Communion, I know not what it is. He so confounds these, that I know not how to take him.

And therefore I must query him a little further about the question stated.

1. I query whether a Minister with his Parochial Lay Elders be a Presbytery that can suspend their members Juridically. I judge this but the same with a Pastor denying the Sacrament at his private will and pleasure. Such Elders have no more to do with the exercise of discipline then with the administrations of all publique worship. They have not so much as a name, nor the lineaments of an Office known in Scripture. And it is a business of the like difficulty to prove lay rulers in the Church, distinct from Ministerial rulers, as to prove Juridicall Suspension from the Sacrament only distinct from Excommunication.

2. I query whether in suspending of members from the Sacrament, their proceedings be according to that known rule, *Matth. 18. 15, 16, 17, &c.* and how they can apply that rule unto the ignorant, that are not scandalous, they may doe well to tell

I query what difference they make between a Juridical suspended member, and those that keep away out of carelesnesse or dislike of their proceeding in order unto receiving.

3.

I query again in what relation doth a suspended member stand in reference unto holy Communion in the other parts of Gods worship. Has he a Communion with you as a Church-member, upon the account of his duty and Church priviledge, or as you will allow the presence of a Heathen in order to conversion?

4.

If you say, but as a Heathen, whom you will allow the benefit of converting Ordinances in the Church; then your suspension is the same with excommunication; for you allow an excommunicate person as much benefit of converting Ordinances as a Heathen. And if you say, hearing and praying, &c. You allow as a members duty and priviledge, then in those acts of worship you hold communion with them as members of the same body with you, then how is it that you declare unto such in the name of Christ, and the Church, that you have no communion with them, as Mr. Collier hath stated it?

If in the third place you say, The Church declares she will have no Communion with such in the Sacrament as a member onely; limiting her none Communion to that,

and from no other holy Communion in worship as a member, then you will make a disagreement in acts of worship, which are all acts of holy Communion, and make a rem in that which is uniform in it self; by Gods appointment all acts of worship being of Gods own prescribing, and are incumbent unto all that are in Covenant relation with him, as all Church-members are untill they be legally dismembred, conditionally; the Churches censures binding persons under wrath, untill they penitently return unto Christian obedience. If Church-membership be not a sufficient title to claim the benefit of a Sacrament, as I have stated it, cleared and proved it, we should rather begin the reforming of our Church at membership (if we can tell how) then at the Sacrament, the Sacrament being the undoubted right of every Church-member. If suspension put persons out of all Church Communion in acts of holy worship, then they are considered as in the state of Heathens, which is all one with excommunication. And therefore Mr. Collins hath taken a great deal of pains to prove I know not what, unlesse it be excommunication under the name of Juridical suspension, and then what will become of suspension? it will fall of it's own accord without any further disputing.

Doubtless if there be such'a Church censure

as suspension, distinct from excommunication, then we should finde something of it in the Scriptures: And in what cases it should be exercised; if it be a lesser censure, then in reason we should have some hints from Scriptures, for what sins, or for what want of qualifications prerequisite unto the Sacrament more then any other Ordinance of Worship. Now Mr. Collins saith, *If he can but prove it in any case how ignorant, heretical or scandalous forever, &c. pag. 4. Mr. Botemans challenge will be answered.* True, but that still remains to doe; and if Mr. Collins fail in the stating of the question, it's ten to one he is at as great a losse in his proof.

Therefore I will suppose, that that suspension which Mr. Boteman would have proved, is this, that a Minister with his two Elders have power, in the Name of Christ to deny the Sacrament to those that are Church-members and in possession of the Sacrament, and allow them the priviledge of all the other Ordinances of Worship and Communion in the Church, as members of the same Church. And I believe Mr. Boteman and I shall never see nor hear that suspension proved by any whatever, from the Scriptures. And I think that the thing he endeavours to prove: either he means this, or else the same with excommunication, if he wil allow them no other Communion with the Church then unto Heathens.

Now I come to examine his proof: and his principal examination is this.

To those whom the Sacrament may not lawfully be given, it may lawfully be denied. But there be some baptized persons in the Church, to whom it may not lawfully be given.

Ergo,

Answ.

His Major is granted, let us see how he can prove his Minor; Namely, that there are or may be some baptized persons not excommunicate to whom the Sacrament may not lawfully be given. His first proof of this is *Matth. 7. 6. Give not that which is holy unto Dogs, neither cast you your pearls before Swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rent you.* He is a great deal more large upon this proof, then he is profitable or pertinent to the businessse: I shall endeavour first to give the sense; and then to examine the main of his, for he is too large for me to transcribe.

I conceive then, That this Text of our blessed Saviour is chiefly spoken by way of counsel and caution unto his Disciples and followers in general, respecting all that were then present hearers of him at his Sermon upon the Mount, that gave credit unto his Doctrine, and acknowledged his Person: and whereas he would not have them give that which is holy to the dogs, he means private reproofs and admonitions; because those were perillous times in regard of the
cruel

cruel carping Infidel Pharisees and Jews, that were such deadly enemies unto him, and unto all that should speak on his behalf: therefore in reference to the safety of their persons, he warrants their silence, rather then to put their persons upon such imminent danger of being rent by that untoward generation of malicious enemies of Christ; and especially, Christ knowing that they were given up to a spirit of blindness and hardness of heart, that they should not repent; and therefore whatever Pearls of Divine Truth were cast unto them for their good, were to no purpose, they would but slight and scorn them, and trample them under their feet; so that the reason is double, why he warrants their silence to such dogs; not only the safety of their persons, but the unprofitableness of their reproofs and holy admonitions; they will but trample them under feet, &c. Good reason had our blessed Saviour thus to caution his Disciples; for, if I mistake not, Christ himself not long before was led by such kind of wretched people, unto the brow of a hill, thinking to have thrown him down headlong; but by a divine power escaped through the midst of them. If you compare *Matth. 4.* with *Luke 4.* 'tis probable that it was before this Sermon.

1. That it was meant of private admonition or reproof, is clear, because it was before the twelve were so much as all

called, much lesse sent publickly to preach.

2. It cannot be meant of publick Ordinances in the Church of Christ, because then the old administrations were in form, which all were enjoyned to observe; And the new administrations were not then in being.

3. It could not be meant of the Lords Supper, because it was not instituted then, nor of two or three years after; therefore those whom he preacht unto, and meant by the word *yea*, could not be in a capacity to give that holy thing at all.

4. By Dogs and Swine cannot be meant Disciples, and those that were followers and adherers unto Christ, for to them is this counsel and moderate merciful caution given. I do not deny, but this place is applyable unto all times in the Church upon the same or like reason and occasion, but I think this place is nothing at all to the Controversie in hand, for I know of none that will plead for the admission of such that will rent you for giving them the holy Supper. And as that is no reason why they should deny it to ours, so not the sense of the place, as by dogs were not meant professors and followers of Christ then, so not now; but by dogs must needs be understood cruel persecutors of Christ & the truth of precious doctrine that he taught, and was believed by many. And therefore when he first sent forth his Disciples to preach the
King.

Kingdome of heaven only to the *Jews*, Christ gives them the like counsel, *Behold, I send you* *Marth. 10.* *as Sheep among Wolves, be ye therefore wise as Serpents, and innocent as Doves. And when they persecute you in one City, flee to another. And shake the dust off your feet against those that will not receive you: but are ready rather to rent you.* You see our blessed Saviour compares the unbelieving *Jews*, Scribes and Pharisees, and Priests unto Wolves, which are a kinde of wilde dogs: the which strengthens the sense I have given. Tell me where the Prophets or Apostles are forbid to warn, reprove, admonish the Church (though never so corrupt) in their publick dispensations, or forbid to administer the holy Sacraments unto them; from the like reasons as in the Text. The Prophets were to give warning, and tell the people of their sins, and of Gods judgements for their sins, the Pastors and Elders of their severall flocks are to feed the flock of God, and to teach them all observances prescribed by their Lord. And see that their people know, observe, and doe all things that Christ commands, ruling over them as the heritage of their Lord, and not as if they were of *Belial*, Dogs and Swine, whom they may shut out of doores, and starve them at their pleasure.

Having given this sense, which I doubt not but is nearer the mark, and lesse lyable unto exceptions then Mr. *Collins* his sense will appear

appear to be. And is applyable to men of reproveable spirits now, and in the Church too unto private Christians, that upon their necessary journey, or otherwise may possibly meet with such that will not bear reproofs, be it performed with never such wisdom, but will either fly in the face, or reproach and scorn their reprovor. In such like cases, Christ doth warrant his peoples silence. Indeed Mr. *Boteman* hath done well upon this text; and although it were not very civil for Mr. *Collins* to print his brothers Sermon without his consent, and that at second hand too, himself not hearing it at all. Yet I doubt not but his printing of that Sermon hath done much in taking off, what he so freely asperses and reproacheth him with, in his long narrative preface.

But in such cases as before the Church, (were she in a capacity) might use her power to reform such rayling dogged offenders.

Mr. *Collins* queries 1. What is meant by that which is holy, which was forbid to be given.

2. Who are the Dogs and Swine here spoken of.

3. To whom this precept is directed.

His answer to the first is, That all holy things and pearls are here forbid, &c. which the Scripture doth not elsewhere plainly allow to be given unto Dogs and Swine.

Secondly,

Secondly, He sayes he hopes it will easily be granted to concern such holy things as God hath betruſted us Miniſters to give out : His reaſon is, *For is it to men Chriſt ſpake.*

How can Mr. *Collins* be aſſured, that all holy things are here meant, when Chriſt ſaith only to private men that he preacht unto ; Give not that which is holy unto the dogs ? Were private hearers in a capacity to give all holy things ? This interpretation will pleaſe ſome men in theſe exorbitant times, that put no difference between perſons in the Office and Function of the Miniſtry, and private giſted men.

Private reproofs, inſtructions, admonitions, is that which is holy, and answers the Word, for Chriſt doth not ſay, give not all holy things (ſpeaking in the plural number) as Mr. *Collins* doth ; nor doth he ſay, give not that which ſhall be holy hereafter unto the dogs, within my Church, as Mr. *Collins* would have it, but he ſaith, Give not that which is holy, &c. ſpeaking in the preſent tenſe ; and then judge whether the holy Supper be here meant, that was not yet inſtituted, nor propheſied of. Nay, ſee how our Author is intoxicated with his own fancy, that he fetches firſt ſuch a compaſſe to include it in ; and then ſo narrows the text again, that he excludes all other holy things out of it, and will allow no other thing

to

to be meant but the holy Supper only, which is not to be given unto dogs, saith he; this is a fine fetch to prove suspension indeed, if it would hold, 'tis certain the Sacrament was not spoken of in this text at all.

3. Whereas he saith, *He hopes it will be granted him, that the text concerns all such holy things as are entrusted unto Ministers by God himself; for it is meant that Christ speaks unto.*

Answ. See his reason, we must grant him that the text concerns all holy things which Ministers are intrusted with to dispense, because they were men that Christ spoke to, as if all men were intrusted with publike Ordinances. And he cannot prove that any of his hearers were in Office to dispense holy things; if he could he would have said Ministers for men, but I shall proceed and come to his second query, *What is meant by Dogs and Swine.*

His answer to this is something large, in giving the opinion of the learned; but I shall not meddle with his authorities; but to what himself saith in his 15, 16. pages, wherein he shews, that the Scriptures call some men dogs in several respects; but I shall only examine those which concern the argument in hand, namely, who are Dogs and Swine in the Church of Christ, whom Ministers are forbid to give the Sacrament unto, and allow them the benefit of all the other Ordinances.

To his 1, 2, 3. account, let the indifferent reader look unto his quotations, and he will be

be satisfied, that they concern not the argument in hand.

His 4. is, *Wicked men both in the Old Testament, Prov. 26. 11. and in the New, 2 Pet. 2. 22. are called dogs, because as the dog filthily licks up his vomit again, &c.*

That of Solomon is this, *As a dog returns to his vomit, so a fool returns to his folly.* Every fool is not a wicked man, yet every wicked man is a fool in Scripture sense I think : but it doth not follow, that every wicked gracelesse man is a dog, though he may have some properties like the properties of a dog, but this is a different property from that in the text, and nothing to the purpose. That of Peter is meant of Apostates, falling from the Truth and profession of faith once embraced, like those that St. Paul prophesies of, *men shall arise from among your selves, speaking perverse things, and shall draw disciples after them, such as these Peter speaks of, that turn from the Truth unto Error, and upon that account take upon them to be Teachers, that they may vent their damnable heresies, &c. and so fall away from the true Church, either to their former vomit of Heathenism, or to wallow in the mire of their former sensuality; such need not to be suspended, that fall off from the Church of themselves. This will not reach the argument in hand as to our case.* *Ans.*

His 5. is, *Heathens are called dogs, Mat. 7.*

27. and we will yeild the argument so far.

His last is, *Sinners in general are called dogs*, Phil. 3. 2. *Beware of dogs*, where he means *false teachers*, rightly called dogs, saith *Museulus*.

Ans.

This is fine, false Teachers are rightly called Dogs from his quotation, as he proves by reverend *Museulus*; and yet this he quotes to prove that sinners in general are called dogs. What, are all sinners in general false Teachers? Then the grossely ignorant are too; And if false Teachers that pervert and trouble the Church be rightly called dogs, then offending brethren that adhere to the doctrine and profession of the Church are but falsely called dogs; for they are to be admonished as brethren.

Let Mr. *Collins* shew us some Scriptures to prove that Church-members, disciples or any one that is called a brother, and within, that is an object of Church-censures, is any where called a dog. Doth not himself say, that one that was excommunicate was to be admonished as a brother, according unto 2 *Thes.* 3. 15? And doth not the Apostle allow a disorderly member the title of a brother? And would not have such counted an enemy, or dog, (which Mr. *Collins* makes of all sinners in general) as before: And so himself too, if he be a sinner, which I believe he will confesse that he is: but me thinks if Mr. *Collins* will allow a disorderly stubborn sinner

sinner under excommunication to be a brother, (for so he takes that quotation) then he hath little reason to count a member under the indulgence of the Church a dog, or a swine. The truth is, he is so miserably out, I think he did not know what he writ; and he had need have a better head then mine to bring all his ends together in this argument, they are so wide one from another; and the Church and World so confounded into one, that I cannot tell what to make of him; For if we say, (saith he) *that by dogs are meant the Heathen, as Mark. 7. 27. Then either those only, or those amongst others.* (2). If we say the latter, then they yeeld it.

What doth he mean by Heathen amongst others, but the ignorant and offending brethren in the Church? Thus you see they must be the dogs in the text, or else he will make Heathens of professing Christians in the Church to doe it. *Ans.*

I but if we say that the Heathen are the only dogs to whom only holy things should be denied, then holy things may be given unto Persecutors and the Excommunicate.

1. I have denied that all holy things are there meant, and given my reasons. *Ans.*

2. That the text is not directed unto Ministers properly, but unto private Believers or hearers of Christ.

3. That which is holy, is to be understood of private reproofs and admonitions, which

which for the safety of their persons, living amongst such Dogs, and Wolves, as the unbelieving cruel Pharisees, Priests and people of the Jews, then so called by Christ: And here they are cautioned not to meddle with them, &c.

4. This counsel is directed unto the whole Church or Brotherhood touching their dealing with others, that were Persecutors and fierce dogged enemies to the Christian profession; and is not at all applyable to persons in the Church, in respect of publick administrations, the which all in the Church are commanded to observe; nor is our Saviours reason of any force for any in the Church, (lest they turn again and rent you) nor applyable to the publike Ordinances; for there is not any that will rent you for administering unto them the Word, Sacrament, and prayer, in the Church; if any will doe so, let the Church judge them for it.

5. I grant that by dogs is meant cruel persecutors, that at any time shall rent and ruine the persons of those that professe the true Christian Religion. And this may be done by some that are not Heathens, for there are many mis-believers and false teachers, that where they are backt with power, (as in the Papacy) are cruel dogs against the Professors of the true Religion: but yet it does not follow, that any that professe themselves members of our Church are the dogs
meant

meant in the text. It's true, we have had our differences amongst our selves, about some circumstances and inconvenient Ceremonies, about the ordering of Worship. And our first Reformers put us in a way for discipline, confirmed by the Supreme Authority of this Nation. And those that had the exercise of the Churches discipline, have been severe in punishing those that have not been obedient unto her commands; and we know they abused their power in some cases too much, under the pretence of singular good ends: Namely, the order, peace, unity, and edification of the whole, to prevent the common mischief of factions, schism, divisions, erroneous doctrine, and the like, without which, in a Church these evils will abound. Now I say, it is not very handsome for Mr. Collins, that professes himself a younger son of the Church, to account the Rulers of our Church Persecutors; much lesse the common people for adhering unto their Governours and Teachers: as they shall have better Rulers, and Teachers, I question not but we shall finde them better disposed; how ever this is a far different case to the cruel unbelieving *Jewes*, and Hereticall bloody Papists, and yet neither of them Pagans.

6 I affirm, That as all other Scripture, so this, in special, is written for our learning and use; and it alwayes holds in the same,

N

or

or like cases, or reason. Whether unto the desperate irreproveable Russian in the Church, or of the bloody Persecutors out of the Church, Jews, Turks, or Papists: and yet I say also, that whomsoever upon tasting of them, we finde them of peaceable spirits, whether they be in the Church or out of the Church, we should reprove, instruct, admonish and warn every sinner, to flye the wrath to come: And this we ought to doe towards all, in our places and callings as private Christians. And hence I conceive that *Mr. Collins* is hugely mistaken, that stretcheth the metaphor of dogs, to any kinde of sinner that the Scriptures compare to dogs, for other kinde of properties of dogs, as worthlesnesse, greedinesse, barking, or licking up their vomit, &c. the text is of such dogs that will tear and scorn you for the best counsel you can give them for the good of their souls.

And me thinks, that the same ground *Mr. Collins* goes upon to allow all the other holy things unto Heathens, the Excommunicate, &c. might satisfie him, as rationally to allow the Sacrament unto the ignorant and scandalous in the Church: all that he pleads to the other is from some other Scripture warrant; and I appeal unto the Impartial to judge between us, whether Pastors and Teachers of their respective flocks, be not as much bound by Christs command to administer the holy Supper unto their particu-
lar

lar flocks, consisting of Church-members, disciples, baptized and not excommunicated, as to administer the other holy Ordinances unto Heathen, the Excommunicate, &c. I think I have said enough as to the former from *Mat. 28. 20.* to give full satisfaction.

Let me tell our Author and the world, that although it be sufficiently taught in the holy Scriptures to deny the unbaptized and Excommunicate the holy Supper; yet this text in debate doth not forbid it at all to those that are without, or under Church censures; much lesse doth it forbid the Sacrament to those that are within, which is the thing Mr. *Collins* quotes it to prove. And thus in short I have answered to the main of Mr. *Collins* strength, as touching this place. And I humbly conceive have broke his argument drawn from this text to make good his principal Syllogism, *pag. 4.* That there may be some baptized persons in the Church, not cast out, to whom the Sacrament may not lawfully be given. And he must quit himself a great deal better (then in his book) to make good his two propositions from this text, before he can conclude any thing for his purpose. And truly I think it was an acceptable service (both to God and the poor Church) in Mr. *Boteman*, who so presently address himself to redeem a captive text, so wofully wrested to perplex and disturb the poor Churches peace, in set-

ing up an invention of men, which Jesus Christ commanded not.

And for his assumption, That the Sacrament is a holy thing, and a Pearl; and there may be some in the Church not cast out, who in Scripture phrase are Dogs and Swine. *Ex go, &c.*

Ans. 1. It's true, the Sacrament is a holy thing; but it doth not therefore follow, that it is that which is holy (meant in the Text) nor forbid to be given upon that reason our Saviour gives, for fear of being rent, &c. And though it be granted that there are some in the Church that are such kinde of dogs, that are irreproveable, that will not endure a private reproof, it will not follow that therefore they are not to be reprov'd Ministerially by persons in Office in their publick preaching; nor that they may not authoritatively be reprov'd and admonish'd, and censur'd by the Church Juridically, for their desperate rayling dogged miscarriages: if there be any such offending brethren, why are they not dealt withall according unto the right rule, *Matth. 18. 1 Cor. 5.* If any persons in the Church be objects of Excommunication, I judge such are; and then judge whether Suspension be sufficient, where Excommunication should and ought to take place, provided they be obstinate: otherwise Church admonition may be a sufficient remedy to reform such scandalous sinners. Hence judge how

how pertinent this text is made use of to prove suspension of some from the Sacrament, that as members of the Church may be allowed Communion with the Church, in all other spiritual acts of worship ! How this proves Suspension of some distinct from Excommunication, I leave to the freedom of your own Judgements to judge of.

In the next place (without any wrong to the Author) I shall examine his third Scripture argument deducible from 1 Cor. 5. rather choosing to follow the Apostles order in this Epistle, because by answering of this first, it will save me some labour in my answer to his second, 1 Cor. 10. 17.

His Argument is this,

It is unlawfull for the Officers of the Church to give the Sacrament to such with whom it is unlawful for themselves or their brethren to eat.

But there may be some in the Church not cast out, with whom it may be unlawful for the Church to eat.

Ergo.

I question the truth of his first proposition, by distinguishing of a friendly familiar unnecessary eating, and of a true necessary eating. Now in a civil sense, I may not have friendly unnecessary familiarity with scandalous brethren, though not cast out, but may withdraw from all friendly unnecessary familiarity from such, as a means to bring them to shame; but it

does not follow therefore, that I upon my necessary occasions in my Calling must shun such, but that I may set such a one a work, and admit him to my Table he being not cast out, though scandalous, or a poor man may work for a scandalous rich man, and eat at his Table with him, &c. or upon a journey, and divers such cases, with relations, &c. Therefore the same persons that I may not eat with, the same persons I may eat with, so that if the Apostle in 1 Cor. 5. 11. mean but civill eating, his first proposition is not good, nor very clear, which he would have his Reader to believe without any doubt, or proof.

2. If we may eat with a scandalous brother not legally cast out as before, then we may have company, and eat with such at the Sacrament, because giving and receiving at the Sacrament is our necessary duty as professing Christians, and Church-members, which I have sufficiently proved before; the which the worst offenders in the Church may not carelessly neglect, so long as they are in a Church capacity to receive, and that capacity remains untill the Church authoritatively have put them out of Church Communion as Members. And then, and not until then, are scandalous brethren, disobliged from publick duties of worship: and hence his argument that he draws from the lesser to the greater is fallacious: and that must needs be
the

the bottome of his argument : For there is but few Interpreters otherwayes expound it, but of a civil eating. And himself seems most confident in that argument in its place. And therefore he should have proved his main proposition; namely, That it is unlawful to give the Sacrament to those in the Church not Excommunicate, with whom in some cases it is unlawful to eat in a civil sense. And for to take it, for not to eat at the Sacrament only properly, as it's too difficult to prove, so it would follow, that he will prove the same, by the same; for then the sense of his proposition is this: That it is unlawful to give the Sacrament unto such that we may not give the Sacrament unto: but there is some not cast out we may not give the Sacrament unto. *Ergo.*

Take his argument in what sense you can, there is nothing in 1 Cor. 5. to stand upon, or in the least to make it good: his proof of his Minor fals too short.

I will grant him, 1. That there may be such in the Church, that the Apostle calls old leaven.

2. That it is unlawful for the Church to connive at their wickednesse, that was that old leaven, and keep the Feast of the Lords Supper with them: but what's this for his purpose? himself saith it's a plain case, that the Apostle did chide the *Corinths*, in that

they did not cast out the incestuous person, that leavened their Communion, by Excommunication, pag. 35. in this he sayes true, and they of *Corinth* put this Decree into execution, concerning the incestuous person, as the only remedy to purge themselves of that leaven that sowed the whole, by their connivence and sinful indulgence. What then? Does it follow because they were chidden for their neglect of exercising Church-censures, therefore they were chidden for admitting the Sacrament unto him before he was Juridically put out of all Communion with them? If the Apostle had understood that suspension from the Sacrament only, had been a sufficient remedy to purge the Church, and reform the sinner, then doubtlesse he would have blamed them for admitting him to the Sacrament, and he would have given the remedy in prescribing a rule to suspend him from the Sacrament only: but as their whole Communion was leavened by their sinful indulgence, so they were urged to cast that scandalous person out of all Christian Communion, sacred and civil, with such a one, no not eat; but how doth this prove, that there may be some in the Church not excommunicated, with whom it's unlawfull to eat the Sacrament?

But he goes on with his proof of his second thing. *That it is not lawful to communi-*

cate

cate with scandalous sinners, let us therefore keep the Feast, not with the old leaven of malice and wickednesse: from hence is easily gathered, saith he, that Christians ought not to keep the feast with scandalous sinners.

True, I say so too, where a Church is in a capacity to deal with the scandalous Juridically, and thereby put them out of all Christian Communion, as the Church of Corinth did.

Ans.

But I deny still, that they were blamed for admitting such unto Gods Ordinances before they were Juridically by the censures of the Church separated from the Congregation, Search and see if you can finde one syllable of a sentence in this chapter tending that way.

2.

Mr. Collins makes a great deal of doe about keeping the Feast, but at last I think he fastens upon a good honest safe interpretation, pag. 38. from Isai. 25. 6. *Where the Lord promisetb to make a feast of fat things unto all people, Gentiles, as well as Jews; by which, saith he, is promised all Gospel Ordinances, and a holy Communion with them, in all his Ordinances, &c. and hence the Sacrament is a part of this Feast, &c. pag. 39.*

But if that be the sense, then upon his own confession the Sacrament is but a part of that Feast; Why, how doth this prove then, that we ought not to keep the Feast with scandalous sinners, when Mr. Collins al-

Ans.

lows

lows scandalous sinners the liberty of all the other dishes and parts of this Feast: but being aware of this, he addes, that the Lords Supper is the only proper Feast of this Feast, that's his sense; first he will be honest, and let every Gospel Ordinance have a share in this Feast, and then attributes all to this one, and makes it the proper Feast of the Feast they was to keep. And he tels us, *Doubtlesse it must be so, because some Communion with an incestuous person in other Ordinances may be allowed.*

Thus you see, let the Scripture say what it will; and although Mr. Collins is forced to confesse his assent unto a rational sense, you may see how his private opinion and fancy draws him off again, and makes him venture to give the denomination of this Feast to the Lords Supper only; and it must be so, because against his own reason and sense he will have it so; is that a reason to make it good, for some Communion with an incestuous person in other Ordinances may be allowed, directly contrary to the Apostles decree, and direction, when he commands them, *To put out from amongst your selves that wicked person,* verse the last.

But still the very main thing of his argument wants proof, That there may be some in the Church, not Excommunicate, with whom it is unlawful for the Church to eat.

In his proof of this, he must make good these several things.

That

That in this 3. chap. 1 *Cor.* the Church was blamed for eating with the scandalous brother before the Churches tryal and censure of Excommunication was inflicted. 1.

That the Church was not leavened for their careless connivence, and tolerating such a scandalous brother, but only for admitting of him to the Sacrament. 2.

That the Church of *Corinth* had done their duty, if they had only suspended him from the Lords Supper. 3.

That we are as much forbid the company and civil friendly familiarity in eating and drinking with a scandalous brother not cast out, as with an Excommunicate person. 4.

I shal refer my self to those that are learned & sober, if it be not of necessity to prove those things, before he can conclude from this Chapter, that there may be some in the Church not cast out, with whom it may be unlawful to eat the Sacrament, or that the unexcommunicate members should be suspended from the Sacrament, and allowed the liberty of all other Ordinances in the Church as members.

But Mr. *Collins* in stead of making good his Argument, he trifles about making that word Feast, to be meant only the Sacrament, after he hath granted it was but a part thereof, as it is one Ordinance with the other of Gospel Worship. He quotes Mr. *Gillespy*, that tels us this Feast cannot be restrained

restrained unto the Lords Supper only. And Mr. *Rutherford*, that understands it of Church Communion in the dainties of the Gospel. And *Ravenella*, that sayes it is taken for all Gospel Worship, from *Zach.* 14. 16, 17, 18. and yet he will goe beyond his own Authors, and prove with reason beyond them all, that by this Feast is meant the Sacrament only.

I confesse I had thought (to prevent tediousnesse) to have past by his reasons; but lest he should be wise in his own conceit, I shall take some notice of them.

All he sayes amounts to this, surely it were not a civil Feast, nor a *Mosaical* Feast, but meant of some spiritual Gospel Feast; and the Supper is a part of the Gospel Feast, the relation the text hath to the Passeeover, and the liberty of Communion with an incestuous person in the other Ordinances.

1. Is he sure that all *Mosaical* Feasts were then out of use?

2. That their Feasts of Charity may have no reference to this Feast? *Jude* tels us, that scandalous loose heretical persons in the Church were spots in their Feasts of Charity. And this scandalous person is said to leaven them, and nothing more opposite to their Feasts of Charity then to feast together with malice and wickednesse.

3. Is there no difference to be put between that one Sacrifice of Christ himself once for all,

all, and the Paschal Lambe an outward sign thereof, that the Apostles analogie must needs be restrained unto the Sacrament succeeding? The rest have been answered.

Let him prove that the Sacrament is any where called a Feast : it doth not become him to give Jesus Christ a nick name.

I must confesse for my own part, I most incline to those that understand by keeping holy Communion in the Profession of the Gospel throughout the whole course of our lives, not denying but that the Sacrament is involved in this General of a holy life.

And my reasons are these.

The Apostles motive thus to keep the Feast, holds unto all holy duties, and to all times : for Christ is always our Paschever that was sacrificed for the Church. 1.

We have alwayes cause of purging out the old leaven out of our own hearts and lives, and purging of our selves from all sinful connivence and indulging of scandalous brethren that leaven the whole, when Church discipline is carelessly out of coldnesse neglected. 2.

The rule or remedy prescribed in the text, as touching scandalous offenders to amend them, is upon that particular occasion, drawn out into a general that holds always, as I shall make good in answer unto his next argument drawn from this text. 3.

But what if I should grant him what he can

can never prove that by Feast is meant the Sacrament only, will it follow that scandalous brethren must only be left out, or barely denyed the Sacrament only, when the Apostle chides the Church of *Corinth*, for not grieving it so, as to provoke them unto zeal, to put away that person from among them, *vers. 21*. Besides, if such scandalous sinners in the Church, as the Apostle reckons up *vers. 11*. ought not to be excommunicate, then not any at all, and is it safe for the Church to deny such the Sacrament only, whom they ought to Excommunicate and put out of all Communion whatsoever? Suppose the Church had done no more, but put that wicked person from the Sacrament, doe you think they had put that Apostolical sentence into execution, *vers. 4. 5*. Let him prove that ever any Church in the Apostles age suspended their members from the Sacrament only, as he would have it. The truth is, he affects to draw up many syllogisms, but he is not able to prove any one of them. I could wish he would either study his things better, or else give over his writing about this controversy.

His second Argument from this text is this,

If there be some in the Church not yet cast out by Excommunication, who are Fornicators, or covetous, or Idolaters, or Raylers, or Drunkards, or Extortioners; then there may be some in the Church
with

with whom a Christian ought not to eat the Lords Supper.

But there may be such in the Church. — Ergo,

He says the Minor will easily be granted; the Major is grounded on 1 Cor. 5. 11.

And he further says, all that can be said in this case is, that the eating there forbidden is not eating the Lords Supper: so saith the friends of my opinion.

If no more can be said and proved but that, *Ans. 1.* it's enough to break his argument.

But he is a little too confident, and looks 2. too overly upon the Text.

For 1. the proof of his major doth not say that in the Church of *Corinth* there were such. But if a man, that is called a Brother, be a Fornicator, &c. which implyes that there may be such in a true Church, as well as a Brother that was an incestuous person.

Suppose that there be such in a true Church, 3. doth not the Apostle reminde them of the rule, how the Church should deal with such, namely, as with the incestuous person, with such, no, not to eat, vers. 11. and then gives the reason, vers. 12. for what have I to do, to judge them that are without? Doe not ye judge them that are within; but them that are without God judgeth; therefore put from among your selves that wicked person. There was one of their Church that was actually guilty, others might be: as any shall be guilty

guilty of such and such scandalous sins at any time in the Church, the Church ought to judge them by putting them out of all Communion, as in that particular case of incest. If such as the Apostle nominates for scandalous brethren be not objects of excommunication, not only my self but all reformed Churches in Christendome are hugely out. Can any have the least shew of reason to conceive, that the Apostle should be so severe against an incestuous person, and the Church for not putting him away from among them, vers. 2. and say nothing to their conniving and indulging an Adulterer, Idolater, &c. That were then such guilty persons known amongst them, as he for incest; or that suppose there were such, can we imagine that they were suspended from the Sacrament only, as a sufficient punishment for those sins, as Mr. Collins would; And so upon the matter lose this Ordinance of Excommunication, except it be for incest? Beloved Friends, I beseech you mark the Apostles order and scope, and you may easily conceive his sense; he had wrote an Epistle unto them before, not to company with fornicators, covetous, Extortioners, or Idolaters of the world, but upon this occasion of a members miscarriage in the Church, in this Epistle he mollifies with lenity his former Epistle, and tels them now, yet not altogether forbear company with such & such of the world,

for then you must goe out of the world, but now I have written unto you, not to keep company, nor to eat, upon another stricter account, if a Brother be such a one as an Infidel Pagan is, put them out of your Communion altogether. And thus he drawes out a general rule from this particular case of the incestuous person; leaving the Infidel world to the judgement of God, but sets up a judging in the Church for the destruction of the flesh, that scandalous Brethren may be reformed, and their souls saved in the day of the Lord Jesus; as I have spoke already. And if I mistake not, Reverend Calvin speaks to the same purpose, upon the same place, in his 12. chap. 4. book. 5. Section Of his *Instituti-
ons*. Upon the second end of Excommunication: 'Tis true, he sayes, in the administration of the Supper choise is greatly requisite, which yet (saith he) cannot be had but by the Jurisdiction of the Church. Then in the second end, least (as it is wont to come to passe) with the continual company of the evill, the good should be corrupted. This end the Apostle touched, when he commanded the *Corinths* to put the incestuous person out of their company. A little leaven (saith he) corrupts the whole. And he foresaw herein so great a danger that he forbade him all fellowship, and so applies the 11. verse to the same with the incestuous person. If any Brother be either a whore-

O

monger

monger, or an Idolater, &c. with such a one I grant you not leave, so much as to eat. Therefore you may clearly conceive that Calvin applyes that particular instance to be spoke of all other, the Apostle names in the 11. verse: this Reverend Author would have none debarred the Sacrament, but by the Jurisdiction of the Church, nor have any Excommunicate for lesser sins, when the severity of words authoritatively will amend them: but when they grievously offend the Church; they ought for a time to be deprived of the Communion of the Supper, till they have given assurance of their repentance; his ground is 1 Cor. 5. 5. thus explaining himself, for against the *Corinthian Paul* useth not only rebuking of words, but driveth him out of the Church, &c. What's this but Excommunication? and yet Mr. Collins quotes this very place to prove suspension distinct from Excommunication in his pag. 140, 141. If he deal thus with his authority, he makes such a noyse withall, no wonder they be not all of his opinion. Then he quotes *Ursin*, which I desire in brief to to give you an account of, he concludes that *Ursin* is for suspension.

1. Because he makes Excommunication the last remedy.

2. Because he hath given fourteen reasons to prove that scandalous persons ought to be kept from the holy Supper.

I. He

Answ.

1. He hath not a word of suspension.

2. Must the last remedy necessarily imply suspension, why not severity of words, private and publick admonition, &c. And to his second, he gives fourteen arguments to prove that the Power of the Keys is necessary in the Church. And Mr. Collins tells his Reader they are to keep the scandalous from the Sacrament: but he deals with his Author as he doth with Scriptures. But as touching this Reverend Author, for my purpose;

1. He admits of no other proceedings in the discipline of the Church, but according to that known rule *Matth. 18. 15.* and that in all cases of scandal and open ungodliness.

2. Not to proceed unto Excommunication, but in point of obstinacy persisted in.

3. He defines Excommunication to be the banishing of a grievous transgressor, or an open ungodly and obstinate person from the fellowship of the faithful, by the judgement of the Elders, and consent of the Church, and by the Authority of Christ, and by the holy Scriptures, and then sayes, when the Church pronounceth of any that they are not godly, they must be excommunicated, and not admitted unto the Sacrament, &c. in his 5. question upon the *Keyes of the Kingdom*. Thus you may conceive this quotation of his, directly proves that Excommunication

nication is that which debars scandalous sinners from the Sacrament, and not suspension, as Mr. Collins would falsely have it be.

By this time the Reader may easily judge what foundation Mr. Collins hath deducted his argument from : he first mistakes the text, and then rayses his argument ; and thus he hath built a Castle in the ayr. And before he can conclude any thing to suspend scandalous brethren from the Sacrament, from 1 Cor. 5. 11. he must prove that those that the Apostle speaks of, were not Excommunicate, or that he speaks to the case of scandalous brethren in the Church, in the want of Church Discipline. I must confess with grief of heart, that his Minor is true, that there are such scandalous sinners in our Church, that the Apostle doth instance in 1 Cor. 5. 11. and not Excommunicate ; but where doth any Scripture forbid to keep company, not to eat, as in case they were Juridically Excommunicate ? A difference must be made between a Brother under Church toleration, and a brother under Church Excommunication, or else Church censures are meerly superfluous ; and to no purpose, if we be as much bound to withdraw Communion to the one, as to the other, in respect of holy and civil fellowship together. So that his dispute about not keep company, not to eat, with scandalous Brethren not Excommunicate, is nothing at all

to the Text, nor to his Argument, for we are all agreed in this, that the Excommunicate person may not come to the Sacrament, nor during that censure, may we keep company, and as *Calvin* renders it, the Apostle would not grant them leave so much as to eat with such, (the necessity of relation excepted) but as touching an offender in the Church not Juridically proceeded against, Mr. *Collins* doubts not, nor any that are sober, but upon our necessary occasions as our several callings lead us unto, we may keep company, we may eat, and take more liberty of familiarity with such then with Heathens, did we live amongst them as the *Corinthians* did. Yet doubtlesse all unnecessary intimate friendly familiarity is to be declined with scandalous brethren, the Church not being in a capacity to judge them, or neglects her duty through carelesnesse: but this is more then this text will bear too, but yet is consonant unto other parts of holy Scriptures, &c.

From the Apostles scope in this chapter, I shall assert these things.

That Church censures are of such necessity, that without which the well being of a true Church cannot be. 1.

If the Church of *Corinth* were leavened with indulging of one scandalous Brother, what may we judge of our selves that tolerate and connive at thousands for want of the severity of true discipline? 2.

3. If the Church of *Corinth* was thus chidden by the Apostle for their neglect of Discipline unto one scandalous member, What chiding deserve they that have pluckt up the discipline of the Church, and have laid all waste, and left our offending Brethren to perish in their sinful courses, for want of the right way and remedy to reform them that their souls may be saved?
4. That a true Church of Christ may possibly have such scandalous members in it, as the Apostle enumerates in the 11. verse.
5. That scandalous persons in the Church, ought to have the title of Brethren, and to be differenced from the Infidel world, vers. 11.
6. That lesse familiarity in civil and sacred Communion, is allowed to the Excommunicate, then unto scandalous sinners out of the Church, vers. 10, 11.
7. That the Apostle urgeth a general rule for the excommunicating of all scandalous brethren in the Church, upon that occasion of the incestuous person.
8. That the main and proper end of Excommunication, is the reforming of a sinner, and salvation of his soul.
9. Here is not one word in this Chapter for Suspension from the Sacrament only; Nay, the Church is not blamed for their giving the Sacrament to that incestuous member, but for not punishing him for his sin by ex-
com-

communication: hence we may doe things that are commanded and lawful with scandalous brethren not cast out by Excommunication.

Although this incestuous person was in Church Communion and fellowship with them in all the Ordinances, yet the Apostle in the 10. chapter tels them vers. 17. We being many are one bread and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread, meaning the Sacrament; and the incestuous person was one of that all, and they were commended for keeping the Ordinances of the Church, chap. 11. 2. and not blamed nor punished for any such cause, as their admitting of an incestuous person; nor was he punished with others that the Lord was angry with, for the profaning his Ordinance in the very time of that observance; therefore it's not well doing in one that is scandalous and not cast out, that doe leaven the whole, but his doing and living in that which is wicked, and being let alone through Church negligence, that leavens the lump.

The Apostle no where saith, if one that is called a Brother be an ignorant person or unregenerate, or one that cannot pray *extempore*, &c. with such doe not eat, but he instances in scandalous sins only.

I confesse Mr. *Collins* hath a great many words about this, no not eat with such, which had he applied to a Brother Excom-

municate, it would be yeelded him; but his argument is a different thing; for it's of a Brother not cast out by Excommunication.

1. Can any disoblige a brother from his necessary duties of Instituted Worship, that is not under the binding power of the keys of Christs Kingdome?

2. Are we as much to decline friendly familiarity to a scandalous brother within, and not so much as brought to his tryal, as to one that is cast out for continuing obstinate in his sin?

3. As the case doth not hold so much as to necessary company, and civil eating, (as hath been hinted) much lesse will it hold in duties of commanded worship. Christs commands are of more force to oblige his visible subjects, then the private prohibitions of a single Pastor with his intruded Elders. It's true, they can excommunicate, as well as suspend from the Sacrament; but I humbly desire such to be sure that they are intrusted with the exercise of Church Discipline of binding and loosing, before they put it into execution.

Now I shall examine what he hath drawn from 1 Cor. 10. 21. to prove suspension distinct from Excommunication; his argument is this:

It is unlawful to give the Sacrament to those that cannot eat or drink it, but there may be some in the Church

Church (not excommunicated) who cannot drink of the Lords Cup. — Ergo.

In his explaining the terms, he understands cannot eat, in a moral sense, and then the sense is, you cannot lawfully and warrantably eat and drink the Cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils: the sum of all is,

1. Such as God hath forbidden to come to that Ordinance.

Or, 2. Such as if they rush upon the Ordinance, yet can have no Communion with Christ, no benefit by it: this he makes to be the sense, and then doubts not but he shall make good his argument, pag. 27, 28, 29.

Give me leave to search into the Apostles *Answ. 1.* sense, and then examine how Mr. Collins and the holy Apostle doe agree in the sense of this Text, 1 Cor. 10. 21.

I have said something unto this already upon another account; I will be as brief as I can. This is the fourth publick fault the Apostle deals with the *Corinthians* about.

First, he chides them for their factious respect had about their Ministers, upon which they ran into divisions, and making of parties, chap. 1. 3.

Secondly, he chides them for indulging and tolerating a known member amongst them in an incestuous marriage, which hath been largely handled, chap. 5.

Thirdly, he chides them for their unnecessary

fary suits of Law, Brother with Brother in Infidel Courts before Heathen Judges.

Fourthly, he blames them for eating of things offered in Sacrifice unto Idols, at their Idolatrous Festivals in the Idol Temple, chap. 8. And to that end he might reform them, and take them off that were guilty; as in the other different faults, he applyed himself unto them with different remedies, and means of reforming, (which would be too tedious to speak unto) is here in this as it is a different fault he deals with the offenders in a different way to the former.

1. His concession with them, that the thing it self (to them that had knowledge) was not simply a sin: for an Idol was nothing, and unto them there was but one God, and meat commends not unto God, though they had this knowledge, and stood upon their liberty, he tels them, If you doe eat, you are not the better, if you doe not eat, you are never the better, vers. 4. 8.

2. But then he tels them that this practice was dangerous and of evill consequence in respect of some circumstances.

1. In respect of the Heathen that out of conscience eat it, as a thing offered unto the Idol, the presence of Christians emboldened them in their Idolatry.

2. In respect of weak Brethren, that have not that clear knowledge in the nature of

of the thing it self, as some had; which upon such Precedents was ready to venture upon the same practice, and not having knowledge of himself, his conscience were defiled by the liberty and practice of the other, v. 10. and so by consequence it became a sin unto the strong, vers. 12. &c.

3. Then he comes to perswade with them to forbear that practice upon several considerations and reasons.

1. He urges Christian Charity in order unto the edification of others, before knowledge in their liberty, so as to use it to the prejudice of the weak.

2. Tells them his own tenderneſſe in such a case, rather then he by meat should make his brother to offend, he would eat no flesh while the world stands.

3. Then commends unto them himself and Barnabas, for an ensample in another case, ch. 9. That although they had power as well as other Apostles, to marry, & require maintenance from them, which was no more then Christ had ordained and appointed for the Preachers of the Gospel, yet they used not this power, nor required any such maintenance from them: and though he was free from all, yet he became servant unto all, to the Jew he became a Jew, to the weak he became as weak, that he might save some; and this he did for the Gospel sake, &c. and then applies it, Know ye not that they which run in

in a race run all, even so run that you may obtain; even as himself denied himself in many things (which he might have looked after) for their sakes and the Gospels; looking for a better prize or reward hereafter, so he would have them to deny themselves in some things, that they might do, rather then to cause their Brother to offend so uncharitably, But in the 10. chapter he comes more close, and addes several arguments taken from their relation they had to God, as they were of his Church and people, and invested with such priviledges of gifts and graces, and of Church Ordinances, in which they had Communion with Christ, and one with another, as he instances in Sacramental Communion, &c. Well this he yeelds unto them, and then draws his argument,

1. From the Church of the *Jews*; they were related unto God as near as we can be, and they had the same Sacraments and other peculiar Ordinances of Gods own prescribing; yet notwithstanding the Lord often punished them for their sins, I and for as small sins as some of them were guilty of; and therefore he would have the *Corinthians* (and all others) be warned and admonished by such precedents of Gods severity towards his own; the particular instances thereof are written for our admonition. Wherefore let him that think he stands, take caution, lest he falls. It's a dangerous thing to goe to
the

the outside of your liberty, and to put your selves upon such dangerous temptations, as to go into the Idol Temple to feast with Idolaters. Gods people before time have been drawn into Idolatry by such temptations; and so might they. And yet see the tenderneſſe and the good opinion the Apoſtle had of them, he mingles his ſharp with ſome ſweet, telling them, that although ſome of them had miſcarryed, in this very thing, yet there hath no temptation taken you but what is common unto frail imperfect man: but God is faithfull, who will not ſuffer you to be tempted above that ye are able, &c. And hence exhorts to decline the temptation, v. 14. Wherefore my beloved Brethren flee from Idolatry: Two things to be noted,

1. He doth not call them Idolaters, but his beloved Brethren that were guilty of this fault.

2. He doth not charge them with flat Idolatry, but is earneſt to perſwade them to flee the temptations, appearances, occasions of Idolatry.

He ſpake unto wiſe men, that as they gave offence this way, ſo they were able to judge of his arguments and manner of dealing with them; ſtill yeelding unto them their deſerts, that his arguments might the better take with them to reform them: but ſtill goes on with further conſiderations, that might further convince them, and be prevailing

ing to reform the evil, by commending unto them the consideration of their Sacramental Communion, vers. 16, 17. comprehending all, *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ?* Doubtlesse it was unto the whole Church in a Sacramental sense, as follows, *For we being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread, even those that were in fault were a part of that (many) and (all) we are all partakers of that one Sacramental bread, and consequently of Christ Sacramentally; as he gives a proof thereof, vers. 18. Behold Israel after the flesh, are not they which eat of the Sacrifices partakers of the Altar?* this they could not deny, but must yeeld it, *What say I then? that the Idol is any thing? or that which is offered in Sacrifice to Idols is any thing?* He grants them that still which they so much stood upon, but yet he saith, *This is something that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice unto Devils, and not to God; and I would not that you should have fellowship with Devils; That's the consequence; and here lyes the argument, If, as you are Christians by eating the instituted bread, you have Communion together, and partake of Christ the end of that bread, then as you eat and partake with the Gentiles in those things that are consecrated and sacrificed to the Devill, you have communion with Devils; or as*

Israel

Israel which eat of the Sacrifices of the Altar were partakers of the Altar; even so Christians with Heathens that eat of the things sacrificed unto Devils, were partakers of Devils. This by consequence was a greater evil then they were aware of; and therefore he tels them, I would not that you should have fellowship with Devils; which had they been aware of, doubtlesse they would have declined it. The Apostle having thus brought the sin home, by such an argument that could not be evaded, then he concludes from hence, that you cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup of Devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Table of the Lord, and of the table of Devils. Doe you provoke the Lord to jealousy, are you stronger then he, &c. vers. 21, 22. Well, now we are come to the place that Mr. Collins makes the very bottom of his argument, *You cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of Devils, &c.* That I conceive is to be understood thus; so long as they profess themselves for Christ, and continued in his visible body the Church, and were partakers of the Sacramental Communion with Christ, they could not without sin drink the cup of Devils, and be partakers of the table of Devils: there was such a direct opposition in these two Tables, that it was a thing inconsistent, or a contradiction for one to partake of both: as a Heathen might not drink the cup of the Lord, so a Christi-

Christian might not drink the cup of Devils, there was a diametrical opposition in these two, even as much as Christ and Belial. Accordingly our blessed Sayiour in another case, *No man can serve two Masters*, that is, two Masters directly contrary: ye cannot serve God and Mammon. And so *Elijah*, If the Lord be God, follow him; if Baal be God, follow him; they could not follow both: who will or can imagine that our Saviour spoke this to forbid such to serve God? Or that *Elijah* forbid the *Israelites* to follow God, because he said they could not follow both? And yet Mr. Collins strength of phancy hath wryed his reason, that he will have the *Corinths* forbid the Sacrament, and their serving of God therein, because they could not doe both. The Apostle's end in writing is to reform the evil, by forbidding them the cup of Devils; but Mr. Collins end in writing is to forbid them the cup of the Lord, and that's all the reformation that he drives at.

But the Apostle goes on and grants as much at the last as he did at the first, *All things are lawfull for me, but all things are not expedient; all things are lawfull, but all things edifie not*, vers. 23, 24. meaning the things that were sacrificed unto Idols, upon the same account as at first, that an Idol is nothing in the world, chap. 8. But the thing was inexpedient, and uncharitable, did rather destroy then edifie my self or brother, and therefore

fore adviseth not to seek our own, but every man anothers wealth, &c. And so he hath done with that, only he hints at another case; upon their civil and necessary occasions, if they bought any such meat at the shambles; they might lawfully eat it without scruple of conscience; nay further, if an unbeliever should bid a Christian to a civil feast, he leaves them to their own liberty to goe and eat whatsoever was set before them. But I have been too long already, yet I was willing to search after the true sense of the place, which is not easily discerned, unlesse we minde heedfully the scope, especially when a thing is in an intricate case, and so much reasoning largely held out, proving that to be evill by consequence, as cloathed with some circumstances, which in it's self, in it's own nature is lawful and good, as here; Now I shall examine Mr. *Coll.* argument what bottome it stands on, his argument is, It's unlawful to give the Sacrament unto those that cannot eat it, But there may be some in the Church (not Excommunicate) who cannot drink of the Lords cup——*Ergo*, &c. His Major he saith, is proved, vers. 21.

I will confess that in this place we have the Sacrament spoken of, and that those that the Apostle blames for drinking the cup of Devils, were not Excommunicate: but yet I deny that it was unlawful to give the Sacrament to such;

P

For

For 1. it's a great question, and will require some time for Mr. *Collins* to prove, That eating of things offered unto Idols, was a sin that came within the verge of the Church to punish with putting such out of Sacramental Communion. In the 5. chapter as I take it, those that the Apostle deals with in the 10. Chapter, are not in that particular list, vers. 11. which the Church was to judge: doubtlesse if they had been such Idolaters, that in the 5. chap. 11. he speaks of, he would have threatned the rod, and given order unto the Elders of the Church to put out of their Communion such Idolaters: for their connivence at Idolaters would leaven the lump, as well as an incestuous person; but herein not a word of any such thing. But he will be ready to say, The Apostle spoke of putting out of Communion before in the 5. chap. therefore it was not necessary to repeat it again in the 10. I, but how will these things hang together?

1. To give a charge to the Church to cast out Idolaters, and then himself using such mildnesse of speech, and variety of argument, as I have shewed, to convince them that it was a sin, granting the thing in itself lawfull, but evill in respect of some circumstances.

2. The main argument to prove their eating and drinking in the Idol Temple to be a sin, was drawn from the nature of the Sacrament

crament, in which themselves, as Christians, are said to have Communion with Christ, by being partakers of the cup and bread consecrated for to represent the body and blood of Christ; in like manner they were said to have Communion with Devils, by being partakers of the cup and meat in the Idol Temple, that was consecrated and offered unto Idols: and hence the Apostle would not have them to have Communion with Devils; as all his other reasons, so this tends solely to reform them in that particular of eating in the Idol Temple, and not a word of forbidding any such the Sacrament, as Mr. Collins would have it, when he saith, *The sum is, they who cannot drink the cup of the Lord, are either*

1. *Such as God hath forbidden coming thither.*

2. *Or those that can have no Communion with Christ, nor benefit by this Ordinance.*

Those that give credit to that sense, must be such as adhere more to Mr. Collins fancy, than the sense of holy Scriptures; what are any of those two, to the text in hand? was any forbid the Sacrament that eat of things offered unto Idols?

Answ.

2. Doth not the Apostle affirm, that they all had Communion with Christ in partaking of the cup of blessings? Is not that the very medium of his argument? the Apostle argues from their Sacramental Communion

as Christians, to decline Communion with Idolaters. Mr. Collins argues from their Communion with Idols, to a none Communion as Christians. And thus the Judicious Reader may easily judge of the foundation of his argument, who out of an inconsiderate rashness most grossly runs upon mistake, and thence forms a silly syllogism, pag. 29. I grant it a sin to deliver the Sacrament to those whom we know God hath forbid it. But I deny that these of *Corinth* spoken of are in the least, so much as blamed, or in the least tittle forbid the Sacrament, the Apostle proves they all took it, and had Communion in Christ in it.

I wonder that ever a man pretending unto sober principles, should be so fond as to think, (that those that the Apostles writes to as Saints, sanctified in Christ Jesus, his dearly beloved Brethren, and writing unto them as wise men, and such that had great gifts, and largeness of knowledge in their liberties by Jesus Christ, that knew an Idol was nothing in the world, and that which was offered was never the worse, every creature of God was good, and not to be refused, &c. as the Apostle yeelds) I say, how he comes to think that these should be forbidden the Sacrament, and to be such as could not have Communion with Christ, makes me wonder : if Saints, and the Apostles dearly beloved Brethren, whom he argues

gues so friendly with, were not under Christs command of this necessary observance in the Church, then here is not any that are, but I have said enough to this already, and all that he saith to this text is most irrational and impertinent, to prove that some in the Church not excommunicated, ought to be denyed the Sacrament; this place proves that they did all partake of that one Sacramental bread, 1 Cor. 10. 17. and puts the thing past questioning. He hath more things in making good his argument, but having pluckt up his ground work, it's too tedious both for me to write, and you to read the confutation of the rest; for it will fall of it self, you must grant him what he sayes to be true, because he sayes it, for he is not able in the least to bring any one argument from Scripture to prove suspension distinct from Excommunication, as himself states it.

I will trouble you but with two things more of his in this argument; for now I intend brevity in all he has further to say in defence of Suspension; for I know not any one thing more much material, that I have not fully answered in the former discourse, in order to his several exceptions against the Bar removed.

He sayes, *He hopes we have all too reverend thoughts of the wisdom of God, to think that he should lay an obligation upon his Ministers to give this Ordinance unto them, whom he hath*

1.

warned upon pain of damnation not to take it.

Answ. What is this but to beg the question, and thence insinuate upon us an absurdity? let him first prove that a scandalous member not cast out, is warned not to take it upon pain of damnation, I know no such text, and it remains still to prove that the *Corinths* were threatened or punished for any scandalous sins committed before they came, or for admitting any scandalous brethren at all; but only for their actual miscarriage in the very act of administration. I have said more for the negative, then Mr. Collins will be able to answer this two dayes.

2. He saith, *None can without sin knowing'y expose the Ordinance of God to necessary abuse and profanation: but to administer it to one that cannot have Communion with Christ profanes it.* — *Ergo.*

Answ. Let him prove the consequence if he can.

1. The Apostle proves that all the *Corinthians* that drank of the Lords cup, and eat of that bread, had Communion with Christ, and he sayes, We that are many are one bread, *ch. 10. 16, 17.* And doubtlesse those that made divisions, and lived in incest, and eat of things offered unto Idols, and that oppressed one another by needlesse and scandalous suits at law in the Heathen Courts; and those that were guilty of such great schisms and disorders in the Church, were a part of that many. The very outward actions of eating and drinking accord-

according to the institution is a Sacramental Communion, which is a holy Communion in the relation the signes have to the thing signified thereby: And in the relation the receiver hath to the benefit and profit thereof, Sacraments being instituted to that end for the Church; as hath been proved.

But he tels us how a thing is abused.

1. *When it is not turned to a right use.*

2. *When no difference is put between the holy and profane, Ezek. 22. 26.*

The first is answered, his latter I shall speak to, his quotation is meant of the legal clean and unclean, that her Priests through carelesnesse made no difference, and so profaned the holy things by admitting such to bring their sacrifices, that during their uncleannesse made every thing they touched unclean; but there is no such difference to be made in the Gospel Church now; that difference is taken away, Heathen uncleannesse remains still, but we doe not plead their admittance into Church Communion. *Ans.*

He sayes further, *That he cannot see but every scandalous sinner, Drunkard, Swearer, Adulterer, &c. hath as great a fellowship with Devils, as the Corinthians had.*

He must see a great deal more fellowship with devils in such, then in the *Corinthians*, or else he can conclude nothing for his purpose; for it's certain the *Corinthians* were *Ans.*

not kept from the Sacrament, nor forbid it upon that account.

His first argument for Suspension is,

That nothing is lawful in the worship of God, but what we have precept or president for: but to give the Sacrament to such as are visibly scandalous, and Excommunicate, is to doe that in the worship of God which neither precept nor example doth justifie.---Ergo, Sacraments are parts of institute worship, and in the administrations we are to be guided according to the precepts given, upon the institution of them, and according to the example of the Lord Jesus, who at the first institutio of the Supper gave us an example for the perpetual celebration of it, &c. p. 51, 52.

Answ.

His Major is good, but his Minor is false, and to be denied; matter of scandal doth not disoblige any that are within, and of Christs family and Kingdome from precepts of institute worship, as the Sacrament is confessed to be; but rather it is thus, that this precept of institute Worship doth oblige all Church-members that are within, to reform their other scandalous actions. 'Tis true Christ gave to none but his Disciples. And the Apostles directed this observance only unto the visible Churches which consisted of visible Saints, by their profession and external calling at least. And who will plead for any but visible Saints, professing the true Religion externally at least? while they are Church-members and within, we plead the priviledges of that estate as all Scripture Churches

Churches alwayes practised, and yielded unto their members. And so long as our Anabaptists own our Church for the Church of Christ, and our members true members of the Church, they doe but discover their own nakednesse in all they say against us, and what's this argument in hand but the same with the Anabaptists, if not a great deal lesse rational, then they use it for? Had we but that clear precept, or precedent for Infant baptism, that we have for baptized members of the visible Church, to receive the Sacrament in remembrance of Christ; I doubt not but there is hundreds of those that would quit the argument, and reform their practise. Christ sayes to his Disciples when it was first instituted, drink ye all of it, The Apostle *Paul* understands this precept, as respecting the whole Church of *Corinth*, for he directs that Church in general to act according to the institution of Christ; for he delivered what he received from the Evangelists that did hear and see the institution. That question about *Judas* is not very material to the Controversie, whether he did receive the Sacrament or not: 'tis certain he eat the Passeever, and what was the Paschal Lambe, but a sign of the body and bloud of Christ? and the Bread and the Wine is no more. Besides he might have taken the Sacrament if he had had a minde to have continued with them during that service, who hindered him

him or forbid him? if he did not, he had done better to have adhered unto Christ in the observance of his holy Ordinances, (though but a hypocrite,) then by giving way to the Devils temptation to turn his back upon Gods Ordinance, and seek for opportunity how to betray his Lord and Master into the hands of his bloody enemies; but for my own part I incline to believe that *Judas* did receive the Sacrament, but I need not trouble my self with that dispute.

I have said enough as from that of *Matth.* 28. 19, 20. compared with *1 Cor.* 11. 24. to satisfie any that are impartial. I need adde no more in proof of this, that it is a duty incumbent upon all Church-members to observe the Sacrament, as any other publique duties of Worship. This we shall with more ease and lesse time make good against all opposition of men, then our adversaries who oppose us, will free themselves from what the Pharisees were charged withall, namely, in making void the commands of God, by their own Traditions.

As for Precedents, the Analogy of the Passcover, the practice of the Apostolical Churches, which have been urged sufficiently to satisfie any that are sober of the Presbyterians judgement, that have not such clearnesse of reason from the Analogy of circumcision, nor new Testament Precedents for Infant baptism,

baptism, as we for free admission of Church-members baptized, and not excommunicated, unto the Supper, and hence were they but irrational in the one as the other, the controversy would cease amongst us that are for a National Church.

I proceed unto his sixth Argument,

If there may be some in the Church not yet cast out, with whom the Communion of the Church cannot be pure; then there may be some in the Church not Excommunicate whom the Officers may not without sin admit to the Lords Supper.

But there may be some such in the Church.

—Ergo,

His proof of the proposition is,

1. That it is the duty of the Officers of the Church to keep the fellowship of the Church pure. This, he saith, none will deny: but if any be inclined to deny it, he should do well,

First, To think to what end the rod of discipline is put into their hands.

Secondly, How to expound 1 Cor. 5. 7. and those many other Texts that look this way, pag. 86, 87.

2. That it is their special duty to keep the fellowship of the Church pure, as to this Ordinance, as this was proved before from 1 Cor. 5. 8. so it's clear from reason; it's apparent, that of all other Ordinances, this Ordinance alone is appointed for such as have something of grace in them.

I grant that it is the duty of the Rulers of the Church to use all necessary and lawful means

Ans. 1.

means to preserve the purity of Church Communion in all acts of publike Worship.

2. I grant that they are in a special manner to take care to keep the Communion of the Church pure, as to this Ordinance of the Sacrament; but still I deny that this is to be done by suspension from the Sacrament, and allow them the priviledges of all other publike Communion in the Worship of God as members. That 1 Cor. 5. 7, 8, 13. hath been examined already, and proves no such thing: let it be proved that the Communion of that Church was leavened for admitting one that was scandalous to the Sacrament, or that their Communion in that Ordinance was polluted, by their connivence towards him: or that to deny him the Sacrament was a sufficient remedy both to reform the offender, and to purge out the old leaven wherewith they were leavened: if the Text will bear none of these things, what is it quoted for? The Rod of Discipline it's exprest clearly from the text, was to reform the sinner, with the salvation of his soul, and the Church by doing her duty in correcting, with this merciful end, did clear and purge her self from that sinful connivence and toleration of such a one. And If this purging was not by excommunication, then I am out, if it was, then Mr. Collins is quite out in quoting it, and he hath said nothing

nothing in laying the foundation of his argument, as to the keeping of the Sacramental Communion pure by Suspension. I beseech you mark, for in this very argument many are very much perplexed, as if the only end of discipline were to preserve the Communion of the Church pure only at the Sacrament; and as if the greatest impurity of Communion in the Church lay in the admitting of ignorant unregenerate scandalous brethren unto the Sacrament: whereas I dare be bold to affirm, that to receive the Sacrament is as much the duty of any such, as they are Church-members and within, as any other duty of publike worship whatever; and their obedience in that observance is as well pleasing and acceptable unto the Lord (they coming as prepared as they can) as any observance in the Church. And if it was not for the correcting of such things that are in their own nature sinful, such as are nominated, *1 Cor. 5. 11*, there would be no need of Church discipline. The main end of discipline is to reform that which is evil in Church-members, and to encourage unto well doing, that every member may be obedient in all things. And for Mr. Collins to say, that the Sacrament alone is appointed for such as have something of grace in them, is only his bare saying, and doth clash with the command of Christ, as also with the peace, edification, charity, and unity of the Church.

But

But he sayes further, *The Word is called the bread of life, and it is to be offered to dead souls, Heathens were ever admitted to hear, and profane persons are the objects of discipline. The Excommunicate may hear, and ought to be admonished as brethren. That he knows not wherein the Officers can have any work to keep the Communion of a Church pure, if not in this Ordinance, as to this, the Scripture saith it cannot be pertaked of unworthily, without examining our selves and discerning the Lords Body.*

Answ. 1. It's true, the Word is the Bread of Life, and doth quicken dead souls where God gives the blessing, doth it follow, that the Sacrament the visible Word of Life, is not appointed unto that end, where God gives the same blessing? Heathens may hear; true, What then? therefore Church-members may not receive.

Or, 2. Therefore Church-members may hear; but the question is, whether he will allow a Christian to hear as a member, or as a Heathen. The profane are the objects of discipline: What then? Must they not pray, hear, receive, untill they be cast out by it? Are they objects of nothing else? How are they objects of discipline that were never admitted unto the Sacrament? Can you suspend them from that they never had? wherein are such more objects of discipline then those that are without; who may hear, and pray, and be present at every Ordinance as well

as the other that are within? Then he saith, The Excommunicate may hear, and ought to be admonished as brethren. Very good; it's well the Excommunicate may have the title of Brethren; but as ill that those in the Church whom we cannot charge with obstinacy, untill it be Juridically tryed, shall have the odious tearms of Hogs, and Dogs, profane, &c.

He knows not wherein the Officers of a Church, can have any work to keep the Communion of the Church pure, if not in the Sacrament.

What, doth all their work lye, in that?

Ans.

1. Is no care to be had how men profane all the other Ordinances by their sleeping, talking, laughing, and disturbing the Minister and others, in holy Worship?

2. Is not care to be had that the doctrine be holy, and sound, even the Word of the Lord, that is taught? That the Worship of Prayer be performed with soundnesse of words futable to the necessities of the people, and with such devotion and affection becoming Worship?

3. Is not care to be had that the Sacraments be rightly administred according unto the institution, without superstitious addings unto, or detracting from them?

4. Is not care to be had to admonish, rebuke the unruly, and to excommunicate the obstinate, to reform and amend them in order to their spiritual good? And is this
and

and the former no work, if the Officers may not suspend from the Sacrament only? The truth is, he puts so much in this, that he makes nothing of all other work that the Scriptures clearly teach; allow him but suspension, which he hath unnecessarily ingaged himself to prove, and he will give you an acquittance, or a release from Excommunication; keep but from the Sacrament, you need not fear any examination; admonition, or excommunication; if you can but dispense with your conscience carelessly to neglect this Ordinance, you may freely enjoy all the rest as well as a Heathen, or an Excommunicate person. Nay, it may be, if you will but keep from the Sacrament, he will allow you the title of Brethren, as well as an Excommunicate person: but if you will not be satisfied unless you may receive the Sacrament in remembrance of Christ for remission of sins, then you must look to be called Hogs, and Dogs, unbelievers, murderers of Christ, the profane world, that are without hope and God in the world. This argument of his doth better become a Brownist, than one that pretends to a friendly owning of our Church; but the poor Church may say; these slanders, divisions, Separations, and confusions, are the wounds that she hath received by the hands of such friends. All that he saith in proof of his Minor hath been sufficiently answered already, both
by

by my learned friend Mr. Humfrey, and myself; I intend brevity, for there is nothing left in his following arguments much considerable.

His seventh Argument,

Either it's lawful for the Officers to deny the Sacrament to such as they finde ignorant, scandalous and impenitent, or they are bound to give it to such. But they are not bound to give it to such, ——— Ergo.

His proof of the Minor is, *The Officers are not bound to administer the Ordinance to those who they know are not bound to receive it, but the ignorant and scandalous are visibly such as are not bound to receive it. — Ergo.*

His main proof of this Minor is this, *If such be bound to receive, then they are bound to make themselves guilty of the body and blood of Christ, and to eat and drink their own damnation, which are strange things for a man to be bound in conscience unto.*

This argument is wholly founded upon that grosse mistake of personal unworthinesse, which I have so clearly confuted at large in it's place, where I shall refer the Reader for full satisfaction.

Answe.

His eight Argument,

If none may be suspended but those who are excommunicated, then none must be kept away but those that are contumacious.

But some may be kept away who are not contumacious. — Ergo. The major is plain, Mat. 18.

The minor only needs proof (saith he) 1. Surely those that are under admonition are to be kept away.

2. Suppose one should come to the Minister the morning he were to receive, and blaspheme Christ; and tell him he came for nothing, but to abuse the

Q

Church;

Church; or suppose a Minister should know one of his people had committed murder, theft, incest, whoredome the night before, &c. shall such be admitted, they not being excommunicate? if not, then there is suspension distinct from Excommunication, pag. 98.

Ans. 1. The Major admits of some question, for *Matth. 18. 15.* speaks not very clearly unto all cases; that instance is of particular trespasses between private brethren, which are things of a lesser nature, yet these persisted in unto contumacy after the Churches admonition makes onelyable unto Excommunication; but I question whether all publike notorious open scandalous sinners in the Church, be thus to be proceeded against, especially when their scandalous sinning is of long continuance, and doth offend the Congregation: the whole Congregation in such a case is to be satisfied, which cannot be by a private repentance (should it be supposed) upon the admonition of the Church. I think the incestuous *Corinth* was not dealt withall according to that rule, *Matth. 18. 15.* Publike sins should have publike shame, that others may fear, and the offender be brought to a serious and notorious repentance, before the Church declare themselves satisfied, and receive them into holy Communion; so that I think for the Church to proceed gradually in some cases, as such as Mr. Collins doth instance in, is not alwayes necessary, nor to wait

wait untill the offender appears to be obstinate, but *ipso facto* to be forthwith censured. But these cases are not to be left to the discretion of every particular Pastor to judge of, but to the discretion and grave judgement of the ruling part of the whole Church. Besides, I question whether one that hath been often reprov'd in the publike Ministry, and yet lives in scandalous sins of whoredome, drunkeennesse, cursing and swearing, variance and contention, &c. is not to be judged contumacious, and upon that account, the Church being in a capacity, and informed, should upon sufficient proof without delay Excommunicate him. I leave these things to better Judgements, but yet I am inclinable to conceive, that *Matth. 18.* most properly respects private trespasses which are not openly known, and how that rule should hold to be applyed in the same manner to open scandals, that cause the name of God, and the true profession of Religion to be blasphemed and reproached, I am not very clear.

But now we shall examine his Minor, *But some may be kept away from the Sacrament that are not contumacious.*

So may some be Excommunicate that are not contumacious, as I have hinted at, which if that be true, then the argument falls to nothing of it self.

Ans.

But he saith surely, *Those that are under admonition are to be kept away.*

This he begs; how will he prove it? For where the offence will admit of hearing the Churches admonition, and upon that give hope or satisfaction of amendment, why should they be kept from the Sacrament more then the other Ordinances? they not being authoritatively put out of Church Communion, is it rational for to execute, before sentence be given?

Unto his suppositions, I shall answer him, first they are no proof.

2. It such may be Juridically suspended, then they may be Juridically excommunicated, for it is Juridical Suspension that is now in question. And as it is stated the Church may as well doe the one as the other: And the Church need not be long in giving sentence in such cases, if there be clear proof; besides the Sacrament may rather be rejourne'd for a short time, then that any should justly be offended, or that a single Minister should doe that which is not regular.

3. Murder, theft, incest, whoredome is Felony by the civil Law of the Nation, and if any can discover any such, they should attach and put them into the custody of the Civil Officers; these are gaol fins, and to be punished by the Judges. And I know no rule that doth warrant the Church to censure those that are under the penalty of

of the course of civil Courts of Justice.

If one should grant that in an extraordinary case, some extraordinary course at the present might be taken; as suppose some profane abuse at the Sacrament, as to disturb the administration by some disorder, I doubt not but the Churchwardens might thrust them out of the Church, & do the like to any that should come drunk or mad; but what is this to Juridical Suspension distinct from Excommunication, as it's usually practised in some Churches? Indeed Mr. Collins need not have been so hasty in aspersing Mr. Bote-man, pag. 98. unless he could in some ordinary case prove Juridical Suspension from the Sacrament distinct from Excommunication, the which he hath not yet done, and it's a great question whether he ever will or can. 4.

It's true, that our Church in prudence left the denying of the Sacrament to some, to the discretion of particular Ministers, as he alleadges; but then let me tell you, this doth not reach the argument. 5.

For 1. this was only in case of obstinacy, being dealt withall by the Minister, who was by the Canons and Rubrick of the Church authorised thus to doe.

2. Such acts of discipline were subject to the Churches judgement and censure afterwards; the persons conceiving themselves wronged might complain, and those Ministers were

lyable to be censured for going beyond the rule, as some have been suspended from officiating themselves, for putting persons by, upon slender proof, even such as their Ordinary upon hearing did not judge competent.

3. The Church urged the act of receiving as a necessary duty incumbent upon all of years, and upon that ground both earnestly exhorted all to come, and punished those that carelessly neglected it.

4. The Churches Jurisdiction consisted of Excommunication only in case of obstinacy, but in case of penitency, admonition, and publike penance, the offenders confession of his sins (humbly in the body of the Church) craving the forgiveness of their sin in particular, both of God and the Church, did free from Excommunication: The obstinate was denied all the Ordinances, except to hear the Sermon at the Church doores, or behinde the Font, the penitent not denied any one Ordinance: lay these things together, and then let wise men judge how our Church heretofore doth precedent the Suspension which *Mr. Collins* contends for; namely, that a Minister by vertue of his Office, with his Elders may, and ought upon Scripture ground to deny some the Sacrament (not obstinate) and allow them the priviledge of all other Church Communion as Members. And this he would have Juridical

dical, although the Church be in no capacity to impower them with any acts of discipline at all, nor have the help of appeals to restrain the rash proceedings of inconsiderate uncharitable zealous Ministers, whose principles tend too much to division, Separation, and confusion in the Church, who would be more careful to further the edification, peace, and unity of the Church, were themselves under the rod of holy discipline Juridically exercised by grave, learned, experienced presidents, which particular Presbyters in reason will not be very zealous for, so long as themselves are left to themselves to exercise an absolute power, to rule as they please in their own Congregation without controul. I wish these petty irregular reformings prove not the greatest remora's that hinder the reformation, peace, and edification of the whole, especially where particular Pastors and Elders are of Mr. Collins opinion.

1. That makes a meer nothing of Church-membership without grace.

2. That will allow them no other Covenant relation then to Heathens.

3. That will not so much as allow them the external titles of Brethren, Saints, Believers, within, but reproach them with the odious names of Hogs and Dogs, unbelievers, and of the Devil, &c. though they be such as never had the benefit and help of holy

discipline to amend them, or try whether they sin out of weaknesse or wilfulnesse.

4. That will take upon him in his own name to dissolve them from Christs commands, and threaten them not to doe it upon pain of damnation.

5. That will make the Sacrament strong meat, that cannot be digested by weak doubting Christians.

6. That knows not wherein the Officers can have any work to keep the Communion of the Church pure, if not in the Sacrament.

7. That will allow no more priviledge in duties of worship to the ignorant and scandalous, then to Heathens out of the Church.

8. That doth insolently affirm that a single Pastor alone, may lawfully suspend from the Sacrament, he being the ruling part of that particular Church.

9. That upon the matter puts the whole of discipline in Suspension from the Lords Supper, either making it the same with Excommunication, or else renders Excommunication needlesse in the Church. Are men thus leavened with Brownism, fit to be rulers in the Church of God? Or like to preserve the peace, unity, edification, and seek reformation of the whole, according to the general rules and ends prescribed in the Scriptures? I appeal to the standing rule of
Scriptures

Scriptures to judge, whether such as himself, or the friends of my judgement and opinions, as to the weal of the Church, (it being judged true by both) be consonant unto it, and whether he or we be guilty of the most folly and filth, and defend such things as is a shame to be named amongst Christians, as himself expresses against our opinion in opposing his, pag. 98.

I come to his ninth argument; the sum is,

If scandalous persons not excommunicate nor unclean were debarred the Passeeover, then such may be suspended from the Lords Supper: but the first is true, therefore the latter.

I grant the consequence is good, but let him prove the antecedent, that scandalous sinners not cut off, nor unclean were debarred some Ordinances, and the Passeeover; I dare give him seven years time to prove that by Scriptures; either by direct text or sound consequence, that cannot rationally be denied: all that hath been said to that thing is, to give us a glosse of moral uncleanness, and thence argue, that if the legal unclean might not eat the Passeeover, much lesse the moral unclean, if the legal unclean defiled holy things, much more moral uncleanness, the consequence is naught. Because

Ansr.

1. The Church of the *Jews* were in Covenant relation, and holy in a Covenant sense, and no where blamed or debarred the Ordinances

dinances of the Church upon any such account.

2. Because it was either punished by their Judicials, or taken away by a continual course of Sacrifices; and therefore could not rest upon them, much lesse bar them from the Sacrament of the Pascheover.

3. Because nothing could excuse from the not observing of that service in its appointed season; but legal uncleanness, and a necessary journey, upon their lives; if nothing else would excuse, then all others were to keep it.

4. It's clear that some did keep the Pascheover that were guilty of that which you will say was moral uncleanness. *Ezra* 9. 1. after they had kept the Pascheover, complaint was brought unto *Ezra*, saying, The people of *Israel*, Priests and Levites have not separated themselves from the people of the lands, doing according to their abominations, of the *Canaanites*, &c. for they have taken of the daughters for themselves, and for their sons, and the Princes have been chief in this trespass.

5. I say further that in some cases the people of *Israel* were accepted of, in their keeping the Pascheover, although many of them did eat the Pascheover otherwise then was written, for some that were unclean did eat thereof, *2 Chron.* 30. 18, 19, 20.

6. It was the will of God that declared that

that such things upon a man should be unclean, and all things he touched should be so by his institution only; but there is no such thing declared by the will of God touching moral uncleanness in the Church, as to debar them the Passover or any other Ordinance: all his, and other mens quotations have been sufficiently examined as to this, and fully answered, unless it be one of Mr. Collins, Deut. 23. 18. *Thou shalt not bring the price of a whore, or the price of a Dogge into the House of the Lord for any vow, for these are abomination to the Lord, if not the price, then not the Whore or Dogge.*

He argues from the lesser to the greater.

Ans. Doth it follow, that because they might not offer any of those two for any vow, that therefore they might not bring their Lambe in its season to the House of the Lord, and offer it before him according to Gods command? It was an abomination to doe those things that God forbad; therefore it is abomination to doe that which God commands; that's all the text will prove, as to debarring of the moral unclean from the Passover. Away with such trifling and impertinent applications of holy Scriptures. The truth is, men of his judgement must do more then they have yet done; I had almost said more then they can doe, or else had better never to have said any thing about this argument drawn from the Analogy of the

the Pasſeover: all that man can ſay againſt us from that, doth but diſcover their own weakneſſe in fighting againſt the Truth.

His tenth Argument, *It's a ſin in a Miniſter to declare thoſe one viſible Body, who are not one body with viſible Saints; but ſcandalous ſinners are not one body with viſible Saints. And he that gives the Lords Supper, declares thoſe to whom he gives it unto, to be one viſible Body.* — Ergo.

Anſw.

1. Is it a ſin to ſay the viſible Church is the viſible body of Chriſt, and this viſible body conſiſts of good and bad, Wheat and Tares, &c. Is it a ſin to declare this?

2. Are not all that are baptized into one Body, of that Body, and are not the ſcandalous in the Church baptized, and is it a ſin for one to declare that the baptized are one viſible body with viſible Saints? What is a viſible Saint, but a baptized viſible profeſſing Chriſtian, that is a member of the true viſible Church? Is not an offending brother a brother, and within while he is within? Is the Sacrament of baptiſm doe initiate into that one body, and the Sacrament of the Supper beſpeaks them ſo too that are baptized: Is it a ſin for a Miniſter to give the Sacrament to ſuch, by declaring that which is true, and which no man can deny that holds our Church a true viſible Church? Who can you ſay is not a real member of Chriſt in particular? And one that he dyed not for? The Apoſtle affirmed it of all in the Church

Church of Corinth, that they were one body. What if Gillespy will not be perswaded the Apostle would say it of all, we finde it so written, and I think it safe to be perswaded of the truth of what is written: the authority of Scripture shall perswade with me before the authority of men.

His eleventh Argument,

The Sacrament is not to be given to any who are not Christs Disciples, but scandalous sinners are none of his disciples——Ergo.

The Major is true, but the Minor is to be distinguished into scandalous sinners out of the Church, and such like sinners in the Church; to the former it's granted, but to the latter it's denyed, What are Church-members but Disciples? What are all that professe the true Christian Religion, and only call upon the name of the Lord Jesus in hope of eternal life by him, but Disciples? if they be not Disciples and within, then they are Heathens and without, whom the Church have nothing to doe to judge in order to their amendment; and if they be without, and strangers from the Covenant of promises, why doe you baptize their children or presse them to any duties of Gospel worship, as incumbent upon them as Christians? If they be Christians, and within, why should they not have their proper titles, and priviledges of that estate? If you can make them neither within the Church, nor without, then it's possible

Ans.

possible you may doe something in this argument; and when you have done that, I doubt not but you will be answered.

His 12. 13. arguments, I have answered in my answer to what he hath excepted against *The Bar removed*; His fourteenth Argument.

It is unlawful to partake of other mens sins; Ephes. 5. 7. But he that gives the Sacrament willingly to an ignorant scandalous person partakes with him in his sin.——Ergo.

Ans^r.

I grant his Major, but deny his Minor, because giving and receiving the Sacrament is a most necessary duty of worship, which both Minister and people stand mutually engaged to observe and perform as any other duty of worship in the Church, and the Sacrament being given and received with that reverence and order according to the form of holy institution, there is no sin, as to the matter it self; and as for the manner, as in every thing we fail all, so in this, and if this were sufficient to forbear the Sacrament, then we must give over all worship. In all duties better to doe as well as we can, then not at all; so that it follows, that those that deny the Sacrament to those that are bound to receive it are partakers of their sin, in not allowing them to doe their duty; for ignorance and other offendings, doe not excuse from precepts of institute Worship, and the holy Supper, more then all other Gospel Worship, while persons are within,
Shall

Shall mans impotency and iniquity pull down Gods authority? If in all other duties of Gospel Worship such had better obey as wel as they can, then neglect Gods worship altogether, it's but a begging the question to deny it, in the observance of the Sacrament.

2.

It's true, a Minister may be guilty of his peoples ignorance, and may fear and tremble at that guilt, if he neglect all or any due and probable principles of the true Religion, that may in some measure prepare them to profit by every Ordinance in the Church: But having done his duty, he need not fear to give them the Sacrament, but tremble at the neglect of that administration, and discouraging weak and ignorant Christians from it.

3.

True it is also, that a Minister and the Church may make themselves accessory to the sins of offending brethren in the Church, by their carelesse indulging of them in their evill wayes, by not reprovng, admonishing, censuring, &c. by which sinners should be reformed from their evils; otherwayes the Minister and Church may partake of those sins, though they never come to the Sacrament; but this is a conceit of some men, that unlesse a man doe what he can, to keep such away from the Sacrament, he is a partaker of their sins, whereas the Sacrament is his duty as well as any other Worship, who is not to be blamed for that, but for his sins, such works of darknesse that the Apostle doth

doth instance in, *Ephes.* 5. 2, 3, 4. the place that this argument stands upon. We are not to reform such offenders in those lawful things, they are but to reform them from the wicked and ungodly courses that they offend in.

4. I grant that if any in the Church should pollute the holy signs of Bread and Wine to profane ends, in a meer carnal eating and drinking unto excess, as the *Corinthians* did, and were punished for, or if by any rude profane carriage or misdemeanour, shall be disorderly in the time of administration, the Officers of the Church not doing what in them lyes to restrain and prevent it, might be partakers of their sins: but this is a case which was hardly ever known in our Congregations. But as for Church-members that come with reverence, and demean themselves orderly, and conform to the external actions, according to the rules of institution, there can nothing be proved against any for being partakers with other mens sins, as to this particular, so far as I am able to judge.

I have now given you an account of Mr. *Collins* 14. arguments, to prove Suspension from the Sacrament, only distinct from Excommunication. And if I mistake not very much, I have fully answered them by removing all his foundations from Scripture and reason he pretends to deduct them from.

What

What others can doe I doe not know, I will preiudge none of his perswasion; but yet I am somewhat confident, that the more wise men search into this Controversie, the more they will finde it a work of that difficulty to make good Suspension from the Lords Supper only from Scriptures, and allow the liberty of all other Ordinances in the Church as members, that they had need follow no other studies but this that undertake it.

Touching that authority brought in proof of Suspension, so largely insisted upon, I cannot examine. And therefore must leave it to those that are in a capacity to search and judge; whether Mr. Collins hath dealt any more impartially with his Authors then with the holy Scriptures.

I question, whether any of his quotations, Ancient, or Modern, doth reach Suspension, as himself hath stated it; and as many practise it: for it was alwayes to be put in execution by the authority of the whole Church, and not left to the liberty of a Pastor and his Elders to deny the Sacrament to whom they please, without any remedy of appeals.

Whether they suspended from the Sacrament of the holy Supper only, and allowed the suspended the liberty of all the other Ordinances in the Church as Church-members.

Whether their Suspension was gradual and made use of only in order to their

1.

2.

3.

R

pro-

proceedings unto Excommunication, and so of no longer continuance then to try the offenders obstinacy, or repentance.

4. Whether they grounded Suspension on the Word of God, or on the policy and prudence of the Church : if he say the former, he may doe well to shew us their grounds ; if the latter, then that doth much alter the case : for Mr. *Collins* doth not urge it upon any such account, nor may the Churches prudence be pleaded, where Christ commands, and the Word doth determine.

5. Whether *non*-admittance of Penitents, Aliens born, Catechumens, unbaptized, were any thing at all unto suspension from the Lords Supper.

6. I question whether any one instance can be given of any Church or persons that were judged Orthodox, that ever maintained that a Church-member in possession of the Sacrament, was denied the Sacrament by his Minister and Elders, meerly for ignorance and for the omitting of some private duties ; and allowed the benefit of all other Ordinances in the Church as members, which is the practice of the Presbyterian party that Mr. *Collins* defends, or that ever any scandalous members were only kept from the Sacrament, without any further Juridical proceedings unto Excommunication ; or whether any Church ever would suffer their members of years to neglect the Ordinance of the holy Supper year

year after year through carelesnesse, or meerly leave them out as Heathens, though born in the Church and baptized. Now I say, if that authority which is quoted by Mr. *Collins* will not reach these cases, they are but little for his purpose, they will not speak to the clearing of the Controversie in hand. Besides humane authority only will not satisfie the conscience of the doubtful; it is only the authority of the holy Scriptures that must satisfie conscience, and be binding unto all. And as it is apparent the ancient Church did erre in their extremity of rigour in their censures in respect of length of time, so it's possible enough they might erre in their severall degrees of censures. Not so much their practice as the ground thereof from Scripture rule will give satisfaction to those that doubt.

Besides these, let Mr. *Collins* give us authority of any Church before these last ages, that ever made a Pastoral examination of Church-members of years, of that necessity unto the holy Supper, without which they would debar them the Sacrament. By these and the like queries, I hope we shall hear by some of the Presbyterian judgement, or others, by what authority they practise so many things, not to be found in the holy Scriptures.

But I finde Mr. *Collins* in his Booke pag. (157.) making some Apology for them-

Re 2

selves.

selves. He confesses their present practise doth differ from other reformed settled Churches: as to the suspension of any they admit, they agree with others, and wil suspend none but after admonition for some scandalous sin. And indeed saith he this only is properly Suspension. We deny the Sacrament indeed to others, viz. such as will not give account of their faith and submit to the order of the Church, &c.

Answ. 1. What did Mr. Collins mean in his stating the question to put in ignorant persons, if none are to be suspended, but after admonition for some scandalous sin? if this indeed be properly suspension, what will he make denying the Sacrament to the ignorant not refusing to learn? and denying it those that are not convinced of submitting to Church examination, and an explicate profession of faith as their duty? What will he call that? If it be not suspension properly, what is it then? the punishment is the same with those that are excommunicate for scandalous sins, or suspended properly: all they doe, amounts but to this, to deny them the Sacrament. And yet they would be judged to agree with other reformed Churches, but it was never heard of before these present times, that a Heathen, an excommunicate person, the suspended, or left out, had al equal priviledge to all other Ordinances but Sacraments.

They agree with other reformed Churches as to suspension properly; as the Brownists
 2. and Anabaptists doe, all agree in this to suspend

spend scandalous members that will not be reformed by admonition : but what's this to the case in controversie, unlesse they judge, that not any are members untill they be admitted upon profession of faith, &c. as others of the separations judge : if so, what is the Church priviledge of one born a Christian and baptized, and of years of discretion to the holy Supper, more then a Pagan, who upon his profession of faith, hath right to Sacraments ? What doth admission upon profession of faith imply, but that all in the Church not so admitted, are Heathens and without, making the Lords Supper the initiating Ordinance into Church Communion, and subjection to censures ?

If of those that are admitted none may be suspended but after admonition for some scandalous sin, and this only is properly suspension ; Then let me demand of Mr. Col. what he will make the cause of excommunication. If he say that scandalous sinning is the cause of both, then one of those censures are superfluous ; if he say, we must distinguish of scandalous sinning in regard of degrees some deserving the lesser censure, the other the greater Excommunication. Let him make that good from the Scriptures ; which concerns him to doe before he can prove suspension from the Sacrament distinct from Excommunication : in the mean time what he affirms of proper Suspension, is all one with Excom-

munication, and upon the same ground, the Church may as well proceed unto Excommunication as Suspension: so that this very concession of his, doth (upon the matter) undermine his chiefest strength, and render all he hath said in proof of Suspension as distinct from Excommunication, frivolous.

But in the next place his pleading, *That they must be lookt upon as now reforming a disordered Church: bad former Ministers done their duties they might have saved us this labour of putting our people upon making a profession of faith in order to admit-*

- Ansr.* 1. *tance to the Lords Supper.* 1. He thinks the sad effects of our late reformings might have put a stop to Mr. Col. thus late pleadings; the issue being little else but either neglect of Gods Ordinance, or running Pastors and people into a deluge of division, and confusion. 2. It's granted by all, that our Church in respect of some evil circumstances in doctrine, worship, and discipline, had need of a holy, yet a wary and a wholesome reformation; that might best stand with the health, peace, union, & edification of the whole. 3. That the most godly and knowing part of the Nation, have had the advantage of power and opportunity to reform what ever was amiss, I think cannot be denied. But whether they have sincerely endeavoured it, in that way that might best stand with the health, peace, union, and edification of the whole, doth admit of questioning. 4. 'Tis certain our late reformers found an establishment of the main substanti-
als

als of Doctrine, Worship, and discipline in the Church. And do they think to advance reformation in the removal of the foundations of the Churches well being? 5. Reformation stands in the reducing all Christians to a universal observance of all the known Laws & Ordinances of Jesus Christ uniformly; and not in setting up of humane inventions, that the Church must bow unto, in order to holy worship: and hence Mr. Col. must first make good, that it is the duty of all in the Church to make a publick profession of faith, or submit to the examination of his Eldership, in order to the holy Supper, before he tells others what they require now, & suspend for, is to be excused, by their being upon reformation now: A strange reformation that's begun in making void the commands of Jesus Christ, & carryed on with prejudices and division, and if persisted in, may end in confusion. Was it ever known before now that Reformation began in admitting to the Pascheover or Lords Supper? it's an absurd reforming that wil allow those to be Church-members, and yet deny them to do the duty of a Member and Christian. It was more rational and agreeing with Scripture rule, to correct that general carelesse neglect in Ministers and people in order to reforming, then to devise a novel way in a seled reformed Church to hinder the most of Church-memb. from doing their duty. The care & zeal of our first reformers, was both to exhort and to presse all of years to actual receiving, not thinking it sufficient to be

present gazing on, or carelesse in not preparing; and likewise corrected those that neglected this holy observance: how unlike are these mens spirits to our first reformers? It's true, many Ministers then were too carelesse of their duties in catechising and instructing the younger sort, and so it will be still; but what then? Doth that disoblige Christians from that necessary part of institute Worship? Ministers neglect their duties to their people, therefore the people must not doe their duty to their Lord; but must be left out and levelled with the Pagan world! Had our Church been abolished, when they abolished Episcopacy, then in order unto constituting and gathering a new Church, a verbal profession of faith in order unto lawful baptism, had been proper; but to plead it unto reforming but of the same Church already imbodyed and planted together by baptism, is to be wise beyond what is written. If *Mr. Collins* plea be good for the Presbyterian perswasion, it holds as good to the Independent practice, for they admit into Communion upon the same principle, *But he would not have this lookt upon as a standing principle.*

Ans. (Why,) because it wants a standing rule, that's his reason I judge.

But then he tells us, *Our former Ministers would admit any one for his tropence.*

Ans. This is somewhat an ignorant slander,

as if it was left to the liberty of a private Minister to admit and refuse at his pleasure, when he might know both the Minister and people were under the precept and penalty of the Church. But what means all this pleading to excuse their rigid practices, but that either they question their warrant, or would have us think the case is extraordinary, and so will warrant their irregular improper proceedings in order to admitting Church-members to the Lords Supper; an argument indeed of late, that doth set the whole land at a stand to answer, but not so much for strength of reason that is in it, but for a power out of it, that will make any thing hold that's said.

158. pag. Mr. Collins pleads further, and tells his Reader, *That there was no way but this to begin any Reformation amongst us, who by our former way of administration of the holy Supper had made our Churches a reproach to Papists, and a grief to all Protestants, and opened a way for Brownists and Anabaptists to fill their Congregation with our strictest Professors, &c.*

The substance of this is much to be doubted of, unless our common people were more ignorant then the common people in Rome or Italy, who are taught that Ignorance is the Mother of Devotion, and I think the most of Orthodox Protestants were more grieved about the gesture determined by the Church, and those superstitious rails, and
turn-

Ans.

turning the Table Altarwise, and the insufficient administrators; then at our free admission of Church-members.

23

Suppose all he saith were true, is there no way to reform, but to remove the foundations of the Churches established doctrine, worship, and discipline, and innovate wayes of our own politick choosing, different to all other settled reformed Churches (as himself confesses) Say our malady in a great part was ignorance, could not they begun reformation with a more then ordinary diligence in teaching and instruction, and friendly admonition, in the carrying on all Gods Ordinances in love, reverence, and unity, taking all advantages to promote knowledg, in w^{ch} in time we might have hoped to see some good proficiency, in the growing up of the whole together by the goodnesse and blessing of the Lord. For it's certain, that the Scriptures teach not any thing about the censuring of Church-members for ignorance simply, and to deprive Church-members of the benefit of Gods Ordinances, for causes lesse then the Scriptures do warrant, is no reformation, but rather an usurpation upon the priviledge and right of a Church-member. Say again, that loose and scandalous members was another part of our malady, is the denying the Sacrament to a multitude of such sinners, the only way to reform them? What care such for the Sacrament, and

so long as it's the ordinary case of most, and they may have the liberty of all the other Ordinances in the Church as members? How is this like to reform their persons, when they may be let alone to be loose and profane, if they doe but keep away from the Sacraments? Such a kinde of reforming that was never read of in holy writ, nor in any Orthodox Authors. Had it not been better to reform according to Scripture rules and precedents, (we judging all in the Church adhering to the Protestant Religion Church-members) to have prest them unto all Christian observance, and to have dealt with them as those that are within? and to have proceeded against some unto the like admonitions and excommunication Juridically? Gods way is alwayes best, and we may groundedly hope to have his way attended with a blessing of successe in the amendment of the worst sinners amongst us.

3.

It's a pitifull shift to prevent our strictest professors from running into the Brownists Congregations, to practise their principles, and so become like them in making admission to the Lords Supper upon a publike profession offaith, the only ground to unite and imbody the visible Church into Ecclesiastical Communion, and so in gratifying some few in their error, require such terms unto actual receiving of necessity, that the baptized

baptized in the Church of years are no where bound to submit unto, nor in a capacity to come unto : And yet are under the obligation of actual receiving, unlesse in plain terms you will unchurch them, and so unduty them, and speak out as the Brownists do.

But I think enough hath been said already as to this, and therefore I shall now take my leave of my Reader, having done with the main things in *Mr. Collins* late Book as it opposes free admission to the Lords Supper. And I hope *Mr. Collins* may seriously conceive himself soberly and rationally answered, as to Juridical Suspension distinct from Excommunication, as himself hath stated it. He hath taken some pains to prove it in the power of a single Minister to suspend from the Supper, but I think it needlesse to examine him, or answer him in that; for I know that *Mr. Collins* will have work enough to maintain that Suspension from the Lords Supper which he calls Juridical; he might first have tryed how he could have come off with this, before he had shewed himself so forward to goe about to prove that which is so denyed by all that are Orthodox and sober. And I know were there any thing in what he hath said of private Suspension considerable, and worthy of a confutation: that learned Reverend Gentleman *Mr. Jones*, whom he attempts to answer,

swer, would call him to an account of his forwardnesse of Spirit, to Lord it over Gods heritage, and to be a Pope in his own Congregation.

FINIS.

THE [illegible] OF [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

I
—
P

A BRIEF ANSWER
TO THE
ANTI-DIATRIBE

WRITTEN

By *Mr. Saunders*, Minister of
Hollesworth in *Devonshire*.

Wherein his chief Strength in De-
fence of *Separation* in a Church,
and *Examination* in order to admitting

To the

LORDS-SUPPER

Is Examined, and the way he defends proved
to be **SCHISMATICAL**.

LONDON,

Printed by *E. Cotes*, for *William Tomson* at
Harborough in *Leicestershire*, 1655.

1947-1948

2490

3012 101744

25. 10/10/1944 - 11/10/1944

1910

1911

1950-1951

UNCLASSIFIED//FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

60-10879-220

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the properties of the function $f(x)$ defined by the equation

1909-10-10-11-12-13-14-15-16-17-18-19-20-21-22-23-24-25-26-27-28-29-30-31-32-33-34-35-36-37-38-39-40-41-42-43-44-45-46-47-48-49-50-51-52-53-54-55-56-57-58-59-60-61-62-63-64-65-66-67-68-69-70-71-72-73-74-75-76-77-78-79-80-81-82-83-84-85-86-87-88-89-90-91-92-93-94-95-96-97-98-99-100-101-102-103-104-105-106-107-108-109-110-111-112-113-114-115-116-117-118-119-120-121-122-123-124-125-126-127-128-129-130-131-132-133-134-135-136-137-138-139-140-141-142-143-144-145-146-147-148-149-150-151-152-153-154-155-156-157-158-159-160-161-162-163-164-165-166-167-168-169-170-171-172-173-174-175-176-177-178-179-180-181-182-183-184-185-186-187-188-189-190-191-192-193-194-195-196-197-198-199-200-201-202-203-204-205-206-207-208-209-210-211-212-213-214-215-216-217-218-219-220-221-222-223-224-225-226-227-228-229-230-231-232-233-234-235-236-237-238-239-240-241-242-243-244-245-246-247-248-249-250-251-252-253-254-255-256-257-258-259-260-261-262-263-264-265-266-267-268-269-270-271-272-273-274-275-276-277-278-279-280-281-282-283-284-285-286-287-288-289-290-291-292-293-294-295-296-297-298-299-300-301-302-303-304-305-306-307-308-309-310-311-312-313-314-315-316-317-318-319-320-321-322-323-324-325-326-327-328-329-330-331-332-333-334-335-336-337-338-339-340-341-342-343-344-345-346-347-348-349-350-351-352-353-354-355-356-357-358-359-360-361-362-363-364-365-366-367-368-369-370-371-372-373-374-375-376-377-378-379-380-381-382-383-384-385-386-387-388-389-390-391-392-393-394-395-396-397-398-399-400-401-402-403-404-405-406-407-408-409-410-411-412-413-414-415-416-417-418-419-420-421-422-423-424-425-426-427-428-429-430-431-432-433-434-435-436-437-438-439-440-441-442-443-444-445-446-447-448-449-450-451-452-453-454-455-456-457-458-459-460-461-462-463-464-465-466-467-468-469-470-471-472-473-474-475-476-477-478-479-480-481-482-483-484-485-486-487-488-489-490-491-492-493-494-495-496-497-498-499-500-501-502-503-504-505-506-507-508-509-510-511-512-513-514-515-516-517-518-519-520-521-522-523-524-525-526-527-528-529-530-531-532-533-534-535-536-537-538-539-540-541-542-543-544-545-546-547-548-549-550-551-552-553-554-555-556-557-558-559-560-561-562-563-564-565-566-567-568-569-570-571-572-573-574-575-576-577-578-579-580-581-582-583-584-585-586-587-588-589-590-591-592-593-594-595-596-597-598-599-600-601-602-603-604-605-606-607-608-609-610-611-612-613-614-615-616-617-618-619-620-621-622-623-624-625-626-627-628-629-630-631-632-633-634-635-636-637-638-639-640-641-642-643-644-645-646-647-648-649-650-651-652-653-654-655-656-657-658-659-660-661-662-663-664-665-666-667-668-669-670-671-672-673-674-675-676-677-678-679-680-681-682-683-684-685-686-687-688-689-690-691-692-693-694-695-696-697-698-699-700-701-702-703-704-705-706-707-708-709-710-711-712-713-714-715-716-717-718-719-720-721-722-723-724-725-726-727-728-729-730-731-732-733-734-735-736-737-738-739-740-741-742-743-744-745-746-747-748-749-750-751-752-753-754-755-756-757-758-759-760-761-762-763-764-765-766-767-768-769-770-771-772-773-774-775-776-777-778-779-780-781-782-783-784-785-786-787-788-789-790-791-792-793-794-795-796-797-798-799-800-801-802-803-804-805-806-807-808-809-810-811-812-813-814-815-816-817-818-819-820-821-822-823-824-825-826-827-828-829-830-831-832-833-834-835-836-837-838-839-840-841-842-843-844-845-846-847-848-849-850-851-852-853-854-855-856-857-858-859-860-861-862-863-864-865-866-867-868-869-870-871-872-873-874-875-876-877-878-879-880-881-882-883-884-885-886-887-888-889-890-891-892-893-894-895-896-897-898-899-900-901-902-903-904-905-906-907-908-909-910-911-912-913-914-915-916-917-918-919-920-921-922-923-924-925-926-927-928-929-930-931-932-933-934-935-936-937-938-939-940-941-942-943-944-945-946-947-948-949-950-951-952-953-954-955-956-957-958-959-960-961-962-963-964-965-966-967-968-969-970-971-972-973-974-975-976-977-978-979-980-981-982-983-984-985-986-987-988-989-990-991-992-993-994-995-996-997-998-999-1000-1001-1002-1003-1004-1005-1006-1007-1008-1009-1010-1011-1012-1013-1014-1015-1016-1017-1018-1019-1020-1021-1022-1023-1024-1025-1026-1027-1028-1029-1030-1031-1032-1033-1034-1035-1036-1037-1038-1039-1040-1041-1042-1

1914

1894-1895

1901

1998

10

in
th
Re
da
an
pe
it
up
up
wh
the
ou
the
ha



A BRIEF ANSWER

TO MR. SAUNDERS

ANTIDIATRIBE:



IN the midst of these unhappy and dividing times in the Church of God, I know not how such a worm as I should improve a few hours better, after tedious labor in my honest calling, then by remembering the happy and ever to be desired Peace and Reformation of renowned Zion. As it is my daily prayer, so it is a part of my daily care and study to endeavour that the Churches peace and truth may meet in one. And hence it is that I so often appear against those who upon dangerous mistakes destroy and pluck up the main principles and foundations, on which the Churches peace and reformation should stand, and consist in. How sad are our miseries like to be in the end, when those that are our professed friends are ever hatching of new unheard of wayes of Sepa-

S

ration

ration and Schism? Amongst others this unhappy Author doth bear his share, by defending such a way that is rarely met withall, and yet cryed up to be the way of truth and reformation according unto Gospel rule. The way he defends in brief is this, some certain Ministers and Christians have agreed to form up a Church in the choyce of a Pastor, Officers and members in some one place: The terms agreed on unto admission to and exclusion from the sacred Communion of this Church, as to the holy Supper, is either a publick profession of faith, or submitting to a Church examination in giving an account of their knowledge and faith unto satisfaction, &c. and so likewise, as to practise, they require not only a freedome from things scandalous, but some real demonstrations of the faith of holinesse unto admittance.

This way it appears hath been rigorously carried on against the consent of some able Ministers in those parts. And something is excepted against their way by a solid reverend Gentleman I judge; with several demands, and queries, and objections for them to answer and clear in defence of their way and practise. Mr. *Saunders* in behalf of the rest hath taken some pains to give satisfaction unto others, professing himself ready to stand or fall, as the truth is with him or against him in their practise: It's an ingenuous resolution,

solution I confesse; and if he will but stand to it, I doubt not of the issue, but that it will be worth our labour to dispute it with him according to Scripture and Reason, the only Judge of Truth. Besides, I am the rather inclined to enter the lists with him in this Controversie, because he protests against a rigid separation from a true Church, and declares himself only for a moderate and lawful separation in the Church; not as yet disowning our Churches I take it.

Unto this I answer,

That Separation that is proper and lawful in the Church, is either made by Orthodox Doctrine;

Ans:

Or 2. by wholesome Discipline Juridically exercised;

Or 3. we may and ought to withdraw all unnecessary friendly and intimate familiarity from scandalous brethren, where the necessary duties of our general and particular callings will permit without prejudice to our selves. And then the question will be, whether the practice defended in respect of separation be no more but so: if it be but Doctrinal, or putting out of Communion Juridically by Excommunication, or declining all unnecessary familiarity with the scandalous though tolerated: all will be yeelded on his side. But if it be found otherwise, I shall deny it as dangerous, and warn all Christians to avoid it, lest they be infected

with Schism, a cursed fruit of the flesh ; and drawn into such needlesse separations as can never be warranted. It's one thing to separate from the sinful courses of scandalous brethren, and another thing to separate from the necessary duties of Gods Worship, and of our calling, where such are tolerated. It's one thing to exclude the scandalous Juridically, another thing to exclude the ignorant who desire to be learners of wholesome Doctrine ; or those that are not satisfied to yeeld unto their terms, as presented under the necessity of duty, when upon search their terms are but the bold inventions and opinions of strong fancies, and not to be owned upon any such account as is pretended. Yet I shall advise to a condescension to the same terms upon a prudential account, for the help and encouragement of all in faith and knowledge : provided it be used to no such end as to exclude Church-members from that necessary duty of institute worship, *Doe this in remembrance of me.* Christians ought not to betray their own and their brethrens liberties to those that have the boldnesse in these exorbitant times to invade them, and bring all into division and confusion. Why should not all that are within, and of the Church, enjoy all external helps and means of their amendment, untill the Church hath taken the forfeiture of their offending, and issued out judgement

ment against them? I think I have writ more to this then will be answered in haſt. Mr. *Saunders* would be judged a ſober moderate man that ſtill owns our Church, Miniſtry and members for true. But yet we finde him ſo inconfiſtent to himſelf, that upon the matter he unchurches all our Parochial Congregations, that he will not allow them to be Churches, but in an equivocating ſenſe; that is to ſay, in no ſenſe as a riſh in it's Precincts; but as a ſeparate Church may be in a Pariſh, as in the world. We doe not ſay, ſaith he, that our Aſſemblies are Churches as Pariſhes, but that they are Churches in Pariſhes; and in that ſenſe Pariſh Churches, pag. 127. and yet he is ſharp againſt rigid ſeparation, and pretends but to Surgery, not to Butchery: but if unchurching of our Parochial Aſſemblies be not a rigid Butchery, let him tell us what is more rigid. They of the Independent judgement doe generally acknowledge our Aſſemblies to be the Churches of Chriſt, though out of order. The Anabaptiſts will confeſſe, a Church may be in a Pariſh, as well as in a City, Country, and World, and in this ſenſe they may ſay there are Churches in Pariſhes, and ſo Pariſh Churches. How is our Church beholden to ſuch pretenders that will ſpeak as much in defence of our Parochial Churches, as they ſtate them, as our adverſaries will grant? And yet he hath the happineſſe

to be approved of by a learned Gentleman for his recommending to the Church a well tempered Reformation, if love to his person and cause deceive him not: Mr. *Manton* in his approbational Epistle to this Book.

I confesse, if those we plead for be not members of true Churches in Scripture account, then all must needs goe against us; for it is certain that Heathens, the unbaptized, or such as have renounced the Christian Religion may not eat thereof; our opinion pleads for all Church-members of years baptized and not excommunicated, as knowing not any rule against the admitting of such to the Lords Supper, produced yet by any. And yet Mr. *Manton* saith peremptorily, amongst all others, none have deserved worse of the Church of God, then those that plead for a loose way (as he calls it) of receiving all sorts of persons to holy things: and by promiscuous administrations prostitute the Ordinance of God to every comer. I confesse this passage from so reverend a Minister as he is reputed to be, 'did enter my very heart at first, and plunged my soul into a greater perplex of passion then is ordinary. Yet not out of any apprehension of guilt, (though I have alwayes cause to flee unto Gods mercy for acceptance) but that so good a man, and an eminent Minister of the Gospel should be so inconsiderately rash in his censure of the Churches friends.

But

But to answer directly;

1. Doth not Mr. *Manton* receive all sorts of Christians unto Gods Ordinances of Word, Prayer, singing of Psalms, the administration of holy baptism? Are not these holy things? And is it loosenesse in himself to admit all sorts of persons in the Church to partake of these? I hope not, and why then not in the other, it being a necessary duty to all in the Church, of years, (as the Ordinances before named:) he might doe well to give some better reason then others doe. When he can charge us justly with pleading the admission of the unbaptized, Heathens, the Excommunicate; then let him charge us with that odium of loosenesse, or a loose way, as being against Gospel-rule; but untill then his charge and censure is no other then a rash slander unbecoming such a person. It's strange and to be admired, that our pressing unto Christian observance to those that are baptized, professing Christians, and of the visible Church, should have such a hard sense put upon it, as to be branded with loosenesse; when in all other duties pressing to obedience according to rule is accounted godliness, and holy strictnesse. But doubtlesse that way that is the nearest to Gospel rule, is the good way and straight way. However it may have the hap (upon mistake) to be called a loose way.

Truly to speak freely, I little value that perverse disputing in most that oppose us, that are forced to uncovenant, unchurch; undisciple, unduty a Christian professing baptized people to make out their argument and own invented way, against such manifest demonstration, which cannot otherwise be answered: and yet for the zeal of the Churches peace and priviledges we defend in behalf of her members, we are counted the greatest enemies to the Church, none deserve worse of the Church then we, no not Ranters; Quakers, Antitrinitarians, Anabaptists, Brownists, that destroy all the Church is in possession of, through the gift of his grace; for there are some amongst all others that deserve bad enough sure, but we deserve worse then all these, if this good man say true. As for looking at a worldly interest (he hints at) I have as little cause as ever had any man, I have what I lookt for before I engaged, to have many tongues and pens against me, even of them I esteem my very good friends; which thing I have put my self upon with no small reluctancy of spirit; what the Lord intends by it for good or hurt, I am not certain, but content to submit to his pleasure and further guidance in the Controversie, being well assured of this, that I shall not loose my labour of zeal and love for the Churches peace, and edification.

2.

I shall speak one word more to vindicate
my

my self and friends from this heavy censure. The question shall be put to the judgement of the learned and sober in the Church of *England*, Whether *Mr. Saunders* himself gives approbation of, or *Mr. Humfry*, or my self, deserves worse of the Church of God. If we doe not deserve worse of the Church then the Author himself approves of, I hope the judicious Reader will forgive us the wrong, and what himself hath published will acquit us. And I doubt not but when our principles and theirs are laid together, and compared impartially, as I have given some discoveries in these followings sheets; it will not be very difficult to judge, whether they or we deserve worse of the Church of God. And so I will leave *Mr. Mantons* hard censure to himself and others, that shall read both to judge between us.

I should hardly have troubled you with these sheets had not that passage much provoked me, nor would I hinder that reverend Gentleman engaged; he may rejoyn more deliberately, if he see cause. I think I have done enough to caution the Reader of lesse judgement from being taken with this Author, with whose smoothnesse of expression and plausible pretences his Reader may quickly be intangled, and carryed away with a sound of enticing words that have no truth nor solid reason in them. I shall now upon the sudden come to examine the main of his Book,

And

And my way will be first to examine what himself relates of their way.

Secondly, I shall examine the state of the question, and the proofs urged to defend it, answer his arguments, queries, and motives, and then conclude.

Mr. Saunders tells us what their way is: *There is a Church formed in one of our Congregations according to the rule of the Word. In the choyce of a Pastor, Officers, and Members; other Ministers and people are joyned to this society, in which we are like to walk till we can see truth or reason against us, pag. 121.*

Ans.w.1. To this something may be yeilded, as namely, that where a people is destitute of a faithful Pastor, they may choose one that is qualified for the carrying on the whole work of the Ministry in the Church. And the people to submit unto him as ruling over them in the Lord; I mean so far as his Office and Function doth authorize him according to rule, to admonish, warn, rebuke, and command.

2. Then something is to be denied, untill further proof of their practice appear.

As namely, 1. That he that is a Pastor of a particular Congregation, and Church, or flock, (unto which he was either lawfully sent, and inducted by the Church, or came in by the consent of the people over whom he is) I say for such a one to joyn himself to another Church as a common member, and

and to hold constant Communion in the Sacrament with that Church, and altogether neglect the administering of the Lords Supper to that people he is Pastor of; I utterly reject as that which the Scripture doth nowhere allow, but is contrary to reason, order, peace, and edification of his people; if it doth not imply a forsaking his Pastoral relation and duties.

2. I would gladly see it made out by Scripture, that one that is a Pastor of a Church already, may be chosen a Pastor again, either by the people he is Pastor unto, or by others that have lawful Pastors over them already; if this practice be permitted in those that are confessed by the Author to be true Churches, (which they dare not separate from) What a deluge of disorder & confusion must necessarily follow! Can a man be a Pastor of a select company out of several Churches, and a Pastor to his own people in general he was first related unto, denying the Lords Supper to them that are properly his own flock, & give it as Pastor to other mens flocks and charge? Or can a man be Pastor of a true Church, and an Officer of another? Or a particular private member in constant Communion with another in acts of worship? These things have need of sugred words indeed to make them passe; yet this is represented unto all with the common guise of every Sect, to be according to the rule of the Word; when
Mr.

Mr. *Saunders* hath given us his proof to make good these paradoxes hinted at, and further declared and explained their way, we may have occasion more strictly to examine it in all the particulars of it. In the mean time I can conceive no lesse of their way, but that it makes such a rent in their several Congregations that most properly and justly is called Schism; pleading necessity will not help you, especially when it's of your own making, running upon sundry mistakes, and taking principles upon trust for truth, that the holy Scriptures no where teach, brings most knowing men under these straights, overwhelming the Church with distraction, division, and confusion. Besides, there is no necessity to sin upon pretence of reforming, that Reformation that is begun by sinfull means is not of God, nor can never tend to the Churches good. Arguments drawn from pretended necessities are of little strength in a sober rational dispute, however prevalent they are conceived to be, when accompanied with the sword. How can those Ministers think they have done their duty in administering the holy Supper to their respective Congregations, by drawing a few of their own members with them to receive it in another mans Congregation? They may as well think they have done their duty in preaching to their own Congregation by a constant drawing a few of their people with them

them to hear another man preach; and if the other be their Pastor, as to some in the way they are in, cannot be denyed, why should not such members constantly attend him in all publick administrations, as their duty? And with what conscience can such live upon the Churches maintenance, that forsake their function and duty to their Congregations? And if they make the Sacrament the distinguishing Ordinance between the Church and the world, as the Author calls it some where, then no wonder they are so tender who they admit into the Church; and thus upon the matter they look upon the greatest part of their Congregations as Heathens, unbelievers, whom the duties of Christianity doe not concern. In another place he saith, *an unregenerate person is far from being a disciple, &c.* and therefore not a Christian, for the Disciples were first called Christians at *Antioch*. And hence they devise ways and bars to keep them from the Lords Table equall unto a Heathen. But me thinks they might easily perceive their mistake; for baptism of old was accounted the only distinguishing Ordinance; as circumcision between the Church and the world, and the only separating and distinguishing Ordinance in the Church is Juridical Excommunication, which they make no use of, for Mr. Saunders saith they Excommunicate none, if they judge their people Church-

Church-members and within, if they have any scandalous crime against them, why do they not begin reformation by casting out the obstinate, according to rule? they are all for admission of members, when they should be for ejecting in the work of reforming. If they be for admission into Church Communion, they must begin with baptism, and I think the terms they stand upon in order to the Supper, will sooner be made good in order to baptism, of grown ones, then to those that are initiated into the Church already by lawful baptism, I have writ enough to this already; the truth is, if my judgment fail not, Mr. Saund. doth but shuffle, when he speaks of our Assemblies to be true Churches some of them, one while they are true Churches, and have both matter and form (which are the main essentials of true Churches) agreed upon by al, only he saith, but not without great disorder at present, (Discipline being interrupted, as I suppose he means). And he must needs speak this in behalf of our Parochial Churches, for he makes mention of the Churches of England, of which some he will undertake to prove to be true Churches, against those that deny all for matter and form to be true, pag. 127. And yet in the very same page he contradicts himself, in saying, *We doe not say our Assemblies are Churches as Parishes, but that they are Churches in Parishes; and in that sense Parish Churches: and* in

in the page before, he thinks the truth of some of our Churches, (as to their Essence) he can prove. A Church may be in a Parish as well as in a Country, or City, (as Ephesus, Corinth) yea as well as in the World. By this you may conceive what a good friend he is like to be to our Parish Churches, against Anabaptists, and Brownists: that although he accounts them rigid Separatists, they will grant that there are some Parishes in England, that some that are godly and real members of Christ dwell in them, which they will confesse are the matter of a true Church. Nay, there may be a rigid separate Church in fellowship and order in a Parish as well as in a Countrey, City, World. And in this sense they are Parish Churches. What shifts are these? but why doth he not speak plain to the case in question, and clearly speak his judgement of our Parochial Congregations as they are baptized, and adhere to the publick Ministry in general, consisting of good and bad, nay the most very ignorant, and in something or other either scandalous, offensive, or remissive? Will he prove such Parishes in their Precincts and outward bounds, to have both the matter and form of true Churches? If he would doe so, I shall imbrace him as friend of the Church. And one would think in his 128. page that is his sense, by what he infers for baptism: saying, *That all Infants born in our Churches are to be baptized,*
for

for Congregational Churches (as they are called) baptized all their Infants, and then, If it be objected that sundry of the parents are ungodly whose children we baptize, he asks whether they can deny baptism to the childe of any member how offensive soever, before the sentence of cutting off passe upon him? So he answers of ours. These supposed wicked ones, whether (as carnall or profane) are not excommunicated, what therefore should hinder their childrens baptism? Hence he owns all in our Churches that are baptized members Christians, and within; for I suppose he would not plead the baptizing of the children of those that are Infidels and without, that are no objects of Excommunication. And yet in other places they are far from being Disciples, Church-members, &c. Nay, he saith, as to baptism we suppose our Churches to be true, but sick, and corrupt, pag. 126. but wherein corrupt? if all be true you publish (129. pag.), wherein you adde to what you said before? Besides the children are not baptized in their Parents right alone, but in the Churches, where the childe is born a member, being holy federally by birth, and therefore to be baptized. You prove the Subjects of our baptism lawfull, the Ministry, and baptism it self for matter and manner I presume; wherein is it sick and corrupt then? I could wish you were more steady in your judgement & consonant to your self, and honest to your Reader. But to reply upon your own grants:

grants: if all children born in the Church be holy federally by birth; then it follows that all parents in the Church of whom they are so born are believers, for the Apostle affirms that only of the children of believers, 1 Cor. 7. 14. And then if all parents in the Church be believers, why doe you not administer the Lords Supper to them? for actual receiving is the undoubted duty of all believers; how you will deny the consequence I cannot tell. I pray you consider well of my Answer unto Mr. Collings; for I must be very brief to yours.

Again if our Churches be true Churches; and all it consists of lawfully admitted into it;

Then it will follow, 1. That while they are within, they are to enjoy all external privileges of our Church according unto Gospel rule, which is one and the same unto all Church-members as such. This is so rational and clear, that all that separate from us, own and practise it; untill a member by Apostasie fall off, or be Juridically cast out of Church privileges.

2. That Pastors of true Churches are to attend their severall flocks in a constant exercise of the whole ministerial work they are designed unto; by the Church that ordained them such.

3. That forming a Church in the choyce of a Pastor and Officers, members, in a true Church already formed according unto rule;

(as to the essentials thereof, at least) is a work not only superfluous and absurd, but Schismatical and pernicious, breaking the peace and union of that Church they are of by making unnecessary rents and divisions in it. It is not separation from a Church, but separation in a true Church causelessly, that is properly a Schism: absolute separation from a true Church is properly apostasie in an Ecclesiastical sense, I take it. Hence his distinction of separation from a true Church, and separation in a true Church where the ordinary means of salvation is, and the fruites thereof, (as himself confesses of ours) is groundlesse and wicked. The first sort come under the censure of the Apostles *John* and *Jude*, 1 Epistle of *John* 2. 19. *Jude*s general Epistle, vers. 19. The last sort are detected by *St. Paul*. 1 *Cor.* 1. 10, 11, 12. Chap. 11. 18, 19. *Rom.* 16. 7. *Act.* 20. 30. 1 *Cor.* 12. 23, 24, 25. chap. 14. 33.

Now I shall a little touch upon what this new formed Church requires of persons they admit into Sacramental Communion with them. And I will give you the question as themselves have stated it.

Mr. Saund. Whether in the reforming of a long corrupted Church, it be necessary that all the members thereof doe submit to some examination or tryal of their knowledge before they be admitted unto the Lords Supper. This question they fear not to maintain in the affirmative; Here they suppose corruption

ruption in our Churches, and therefore with men well satisfied with their present frame and temper, not looking on them as under any sub. disorder, as we suppose: with such we desire not much to dispute, we can expect little of reason, or truth from men of that mind.

This question is but ambiguously stated, *Ans. 1.* and should be further explained as to the particular branches of it: for as to our Church in respect of doctrine, it must be spoken with thankfulness, that long hath the light thereof filled our Horizon, as himself confessed pag. 6. and this Examination is only in reference to sound knowledge, the means whereof the Church was not corrupted in, so as to deserve the denomination of a long corrupted Church in that respect. For generally the principles that were taught, and received by the people were Orthodox, that the people cannot in reason generally lye under the Suspension of heretical knowledge, for they have been so long habituated to sound words in respect of several Creeds which very frequently were professed and assented unto in our assemblies, with such plainness of Catechising, &c. that in respect of the ordinary means of the peoples knowing in a competent sense (which is the subject matter that examination and trial only relates unto in the question) that the Church cannot be truly said, to have been a long corrupted Church. And then that

T 2

clause

clause in the question (*as to us*) is needlesse, which indeed upon the matter is the very cause of the question, that being taken away makes the question fall, for then the question will be, Whether in a reformed Church, as to knowledge, examination be necessary in all we admit to the Sacrament? And I judge this the most proper question, by what himself hath acknowledged of our Church in respect of *purity of Doctrine*, the only means of sound knowledge to her members, they being generally educated and trained up therein from their youth; so that as to knowledge the Church was not corrupt; That many of her members have but little knowledge, and are weak in the faith, is confessed, and is their sin, but whether it be such a sin that the Church may chastise with discipline, I very much doubt of: they being otherwise not tainted with scandalous offending. And how a Church-member should be denied a necessary duty of institute worship without some proper act of discipline, I cannot tell. I confesse had the generality of our people been poysoned with Popish heretical principles, touching the holy Supper, and all other worship, there had been a rational cause of the question, as he hath stated it, and a ground sufficient to be suspicious of the knowledge of most, whether that little most know were true or false, Orthodox or heretical. And if npon complaint

plaint or tryal they should be found heretical, and will not be reclaimed, I think such come under the chastisement of the Church; but this is not our case, nor question.

If by the word (necessary) in the question, be meant a duty incumbent upon all to submit unto, and that every one must stand to the trial of their Pastor and Officers in respect of their knowledge, before they can lawfully be admitted unto the Lords Supper; It will be denied, and the Author must give us stronger proofs and arguments for the affirmative then what he hath urged in his *Antidiatribes*; we shall examine his proofs anon.

I should grant him that it might be necessary, in respect of some benefit and help to a more profitable receiving, if people would come off in such a prudential way, only to that end they may be prepared better, but to make use of it to that end, as either to dissuade them from their duty, or exclude them from a necessary duty of solemn worship, out of a persuasion that their knowledge is incompetent, this I utterly dislike as rash and groundlesse.

I grant that the Church actually impowered with the exercise of true discipline, may and ought to convent any of her members, before them complained of or suspected for matter of scandal, and examine them, and finding them guilty and impenitent, may

censure them, but the question intends another thing.

I grant that self Examination is a necessary duty in order to receiving, and that may satisfy the question as it's stated; for that is (some examination) to receiving as his expression is, when this is indeavoured of professing Christians, although they neglect that which is Pastoral, it's a question whether they deserve to be excluded or no. But to reply. If Church Examination be a necessary duty to all admission: As he would; why not unto every time they come to receive? For that examination that the Apostle enjoins, holds to every time the holy Sacrament is administered; but they require it but once, and that only upon a supposition of a general corruption of our Churches, (p. 22.) But were not the Church of the *Jews* as generally corrupt as ours at some times, and yet at such a time did not as godly men as your selves call all to observe the Passeeover without such a way of examination you shall lead forth think of *Josiah*, *Jehosaphat*, *Hezekiah*, *Nehemiah*, &c. You confesse the Passeeover and Supper are the same for substance; and in answer to the first objection, you say Christ had communicated with his Disciples before in the Passeeover, therefore he needed not examine those that were admitted before: If your reason be good, I ask what need you examine those that have been admitted

mitted to the Lords Supper before? Nay what need you examine those that are admitted unto holy Baptism before, that are of years, not excommunicated? That which was necessary unto Baptism was sufficient to admission into the Church, where Sacramental Communion (only) is: and which none ever was denied in the Apostolical Churches during their abode in those Churches: And to those that judge ours lawfully baptized, and in a true Church, cannot rationally refuse to admit them while they are within. And again if the examination defended be a necessary duty, why not binding unto all Church-members of the same kinde? Necessary duties use to be universal. How comes this to be restrained only to such as well may be suspected for incompetent knowledge? Sure if it be a necessary duty, it is incumbent upon all in the Church, or else to none at all; if a Minister be at liberty to dispense with some, a gift may blind their eyes at length. But what Scriptures determine of the just measure of this competent knowledge that the Ignorant are to be examined of, without which they must be excluded the Sacrament? if no certain rule can be found to satisfie us in this, how can men determine of it? Then it will follow, as in all other doubtful or groundless things; so many men, so many mindes, and will but adde more fewel to our too many hot

divisions already. And know an unquestionable duty of publick worship should be made void upon such trifling uncertainties, that not any are able to determine of, seems to me, too great a boldnesse in man. Thus as briefly as I could, I have not only questioned the question, but have examined it in particulars thereof, by explaining and yeelding something, and by denying other things intended by the Author. And I think the true question is this.

Whether it be the duty of all professing the true Religion, (and admitted into fellowship and Communion of the Church already by holy baptism, and constantly attend the publick Worship of God) to give an account of their knowledge and faith upon the command and examination of their Minister and Officers, and either to be admitted or refused the Lords Supper, as these examiners shall approve, or not approve, of the measure, truth and soundnesse of the knowledge of all, and whether all that refuse to submit to this duty, are justly to be excluded the Sacrament.

I dare say that's the proper question as to our case, and now I come to examine the Scriptures and reasons laid down by Mr. *Saunders*, to prove the affirmative. Namely, that all are bound to stand to this tryal before they can lawfully be admitted to the Lords Supper: His quotations are many, and

and he is something large upon them, therefore I must desire the Readers patience in my answer; yet I will promise thee I have laboured to avoid all tedious impertinences.

Mr. Saunders first proof, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be done decently and in order. This, he saith, is a general rule, serving till the worlds end, to direct the Churches in matters of outward worship, whereof this of admission to, and exclusion from the Lords Supper is one.*

Who knows not that the Apostle as in *Ans. 1.* the 11. chapter, reproves the Church of Corinth for her divisions and disorders in their publick Assemblies, in the very time of administering the Lords Supper, and prescribes them rules and orders in special as to the reforming of those profane disorders: so in this chapter he takes them up for some other disorders they were guilty of, in the like assemblies in the carrying on of some other exercises of Religion amongst themselves, as verse 26. doth intimate: *How is it then brethren when you come together, every one of you hath a Psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation? let all things be done to edifying.* The fault was this, in the exercises of these different gifts by different persons, they observed no order, but made a confusion, all exercising their particular gifts at once, that not any could be edified by anothers gift; either for his own, or because so many spoke together, that those

those that were hearers could not tell which to attend, &c. Therefore after many particular directions prescribed to particular cases, lest the Apostle should omit some other things, that might fall out about the ordering of Worship in the Church of God, he gives them more general rules that might reach all other the like cases. *Let all things be done decently, and in order.* The Apostle orders speech and silence in their Assemblies so, as all may be edified and comforted, but here is not a word of admission to and exclusion from the Sacrament, nor any other Ordinance in the Church: for they that were received into the Church, were bound as Christians to attend upon all Ordinances of publick Worship, while they were within: this rule was given to direct us about some necessary circumstances in the ordering of necessary worship, which other Scriptures inforce upon all in the Church to observe, as time and place, and external order in all parts of institute worships: decent and reverent gesture, silence and watchings, authorized administrators, &c. But Mr. Saunders consequence is false, for it is not such a general rule as he would have it, namely to warrant a Minister to receive of his people to duties of necessary worship whom he pleases, and refuse whom he pleases, is this to direct in matters or circumstances of outward worship, to exclude Christians from their

their necessary duties of worship? If this will warrant his excluding from one Ordinance of worship, then from all at his pleasure; if a persons admission, and exclusion be but a circumstance of outward worship, then our Bishops did well in forbidding preaching and hearing in the afternoon, and punishing those that made conscience of their duty otherwise. By this Church-members are not left at liberty to doe what Christ commands, but what the Church commands: we may see how ways of mens own choosing will warp them. If this consequence had been published by a Bishop in their times, Christians would have startled at it. But he goes on. *And supposes, they had no particular warrant in Gods Word to bear them out, yet, saith he, if our course be holy and orderly, it hath warrant from that general rule.*

1. That course cannot be holy and orderly that tends to a desperate schism in the Church, as I have hinted already. *Ans.*

2. That tends to their peoples hinderance and exclusion from their necessary duties of worship as Christians.

3. That is warranted by no Scripture rule.

4. The discovery of the fallacie of your consequence from this general rule, makes your supposition nothing for your purpose. The Apostle speaks of such a rational prudential decency and order in the Church, that
may

may be necessary and yet no where in the Scriptures determined of, as to particulars, either in commanding or forbidding. And would Ministers take up an order (under the same notion) to instruct, ask questions of their people to that end, they may better profit by every Ordinance, and be incouraged to a more diligent and frequent attendance thereon in hope of a blessing, I conceive were nearer the minde of Christ from this text, then what it is urged for. Next he assumes something from what is granted by Bishop Abbot, but that's nothing to the text, nor proof of his way, pag. 131. The Text he saith will yeeld us this argument, page. 133.

Mr. Saund. *Where is no due order in Sacramental administrations, there Gods Word is not observed. But where all are admitted there is no order. Therefore in admission of all Gods will is not observed.*

The major may be yeelded, the Minor is to be denyed by distinguishing.

Ans.

1. Where all are admitted without distinction of Christian and Heathen, baptized or unbaptized, a member in Communion, and one under Excommunication, &c. there is no order, it's true, as being against many Scriptures.

But 2. where (*all*) are admitted that are of a true Orthodox Church, and are baptized professing Christians, under the Churches indulgence

dulgence, the children of whom himself accounts (*holy*) federally, of these the Minor is to be denyed, and so the argument fals; for pressing of baptized Christians or believers, come under the obligation of this part of institute worship in the Church as of any other the precept is commended to the whole Church, *As oft as you doe this doe it in remembrance of me*, 1 Cor. 11. 24, 25. And if a Minister will be faithful to his charge, he must teach and incourage al of his flock to observe and doe (*all*) that Christ commands; Mat. 28. 20. And how can they say as St. Paul did, that they kept back nothing that was necessary for the Church, when they keep back so necessary an Ordinance from their respective flocks? The Lord discover unto his servants their great neglects and error.

Mr. Saunders addes in proof of his Minor thus;

Where there is mixture and confusion of good and bad, fit and unfit, there is no order. But where all are admitted is this mixture. Ergo.

What is an evill mixture, and against the Word, I have explained above, and to call this mixture of good and bad (as he calls them) evill in the Church in reference to external Ordinances, and duties of worship and homage, is very unsound, and doth accuse the wisdom of God of weaknesse in constituting his visible Church so, as to consist of good and bad, fit and unfit, but

Ans.

but are not all things sanctified by the warrant of the Word to the whole Church? And are not all things clean to them in a federal sense? Is there not grace and mercy enough in the Gospel Covenant made to the professing Church, to cure the worst, Gods blessing concurring with the necessary means used to that end? Let not men be dividing where God joyns by his own constitution and merciful gift, comprehending the natural children of all parents in the Church with the Church, for the gathering of his elect out of them all. To call this a mixture in an evil sense as corrupting the Church and Ordinances, is a slander and an unjust reproach brought upon the Church by rash and inconsiderate heads, care is to be taken for the exercise of true discipline, for the amendment of the scandalous, as is provided in all my writings. But there is nothing can be said otherwise to exclude any in the Church from necessary duties of institute Worship. And therefore the vanity of that self flattery is discovered in his 134. pag. wherein he applauds their course and way, as tending to advance order and holiness in the Church, which indeed they are guilty of the breach of very great commands of Jesus Christ, in setting up this pretended order and holiness. Let them consider better of it, and free themselves from what I charge them with, if they can tell how, or else
make

make good what they promise in returning from their way of schism, to their Pastoral duties to their respective flocks.

His second proof is *Jer. 15. 19.* *If thou takest the precious from the vile, then shalt thou be at my mouth.*

In short to give a few hints of the true *Ans.* sense before I examine his.

The people of *Judah* and *Jerusalem* were in a most desperate apostasie in the reign of King *Zedekiah*, the time of this holy Prophets prophesying, for they had forsaken the Lord and his prescribed worship, which but a little before godly *Josiah* had put them in possession of according to the laws of God, left in writing by *Moses*; but his son being wicked, turned to Idolatry, and all the people with him ran a whoring after strange Gods, insomuch that the Lord complains of them, according to thy Cities are thy Gods oh *Judah*, for which and many other of their abominable doings, the Lord sent his servant *Jeremie* to denounce Gods judgements against them, especially that judgement of their being subdued by the King of *Babylon*, and carryed away captives by him. This message did so vex them, that they wholly set themselves in opposition to the Prophet, insomuch that the good man was so tired out with their revilings and threats, that out of his frailty he grew into a passionate discontent, questioning the message that he had

had received from the mouth of the Lord ; and staggering at Gods promise of protection made in particular to him , chap. 1. 8. here he chargeth God rashly, as if he had been to him as a lyar, and as waters that fail, chap. 15. 18. this 19. verse is an answer to *Jeremiahs* rash charge. Therefore thus saith the Lord, if thou return or repent, then will I bring thee again, and thou shalt stand before me, if thou take away the precious from the vile, then shalt thou be as my Word, let them return to thee and submit to the truth of that message I have sent by thee. But do not thou return to them by reason of their extream unreasonable opposition they raise against thee : for I will be as good to thee as ever I promised to be: for I will make thee to this people a strong brazen wall, and they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail, &c. v. 20. *Jeremiahs* duty was to bear up himself in discharge of the message sent upon with courage, constancy, faithfulness, against all discouragements met with whatever, he was to denounce the judgements of God against them for their provoking sins, to bring them to repentance, or leave them without excuse, and in so doing his duty, the Word of the Lord spoken by him should have an answerable effect upon the spirits of men, some should believe it and reform, and yeeld themselves voluntarily to the King of *Babylon*, and so live : others should be hardened

hardened and accuse the Prophet of revolting from his own Nation, and holding intelligence with an enemy, and discouraging the people from their arms by perswading them to yeild and live, and so set themselves against him, and reject his word and perish. Thus the Word of the Lord made a separation for the saving of some and destruction of others I take it. And so the stream of Interpreters runs, but to this Mr. Saunders answers;

If this Text allows only a doctrinal separation, and denies any other, then Excommunication fals.

We doe not say that this Text denies any other separation, but this we say, it was but doctrinal of it self, in respect of act, as touching the Prophet; yet in respect of the effect the Word took upon them, it became personal and the instrumental cause of some to separate from that deluge of Idolatry the most were involved in: nor is there any danger that Excommunication should fall, unlesse it stands upon this text, so long as other texts of holy Writ uphold it: which himself cannot be ignorant of, and this separation of Juridical Excommunication we grant, and examination in order unto it. But what is this in favour of the thing in the question, that is only in reference to a persons knowledge, which not being judged competent, should be excluded the Sacrament? these are huge different cases.

U

Takes

Mr. Saund. Takes occasion to speak of separation as Ecclesiastical, and that twofold.

1. *From an Idolatrous Church, as we from Rome, justly, &c.*

2. *When a Church doth separate from the scandalous members of her own body; Or separate such as are scandalous from her: this he saith is grounded upon the Text in hand, and 2 Thess. 3. 6. This is tearmed a negative separation in a Church, not from it. This he saith, is their case, they separate only in that wherein those separated from cannot lawfully joyn, pag. 136.*

Ans.

The first separation may be lawful when we cannot have communion with them in the main essentials of doctrine and worship, the whole of these holy things being mingled with the superstitious inventions and heretical doctrines of men; the text in hand doth justify this: For the Church of the *Jews* was then Idolatrous in their worship, and had forsaken the Lord and his prescribed worship; therefore he denounceth most terrible judgements against them by his Prophet to reform them, which could not be as to particulars without separating from their Idolatrous assemblies of worship.

But to say as he, in the next, that this text doth warrant a separation in a Church (where the doctrine and worship is holy, and owned by the presence and blessing of the Lord) as themselves cannot deny of ours, is too impudently asserted.

How

How proper it is for a Church to separate from the scandalous members of her own body, I am yet to learn; that she may separate such as are scandalous from her Jurisdictionally is all along granted, but this is nothing to their case, who confesse they excommunicate none.

But here lies the bottom of all, *They separate only in that wherein those separated from cannot lawfully joyn.* Let's examine how the text in hand will warrant them in that, Did *Jer.* and those that were separated by vertue of Gods Word, separate from the other of the Church, because they could not lawfully joyn with them in Gods own prescribed worship, which all were enjoined by Gods command to observe? Then it will be some ground for your way: but as there can be no such thing in the text, so no colour of ground for you to plead hence in defence of your way. Nay, it may rather reflect upon you, thus, As they fell off from that Reformation of *Josiah* that had reduced the people to a conformity to the Law, and chose to themselves new Idolatrous wayes that God commanded not, so you fall off from that Reformation begun according to the Laws of Christ, enjoining all professing baptized Christians to a conformity to all his laws and Ordinances in the Church, and choose to your selves a way of Schism and separation needlessly, without the least shew of solid ground; for if an *Israelite*,

U 2

thought

though otherwise ignorant and wicked, was privileged to joyn with the Church in all holy and commanded worship, then, why not a Christian as well under an equal capacity? If those you separate from in that of the Sacrament be under the obligation of Christs command, as they are professing baptized Christians, which none can deny upon good ground, then Christs command is of sufficient warrant to justify their lawful joyning with you, as in all other commanded duties of worship you seeme to practise; the antecedent hath been proved already from 1 Cor. 11. 24, 25. Matth. 28. 20. the consequence will be yeilded I hope. But to give you the sum of all he draws from the text in hand.

That which God commands is our duty; but God requires more then a doctrinal separation in applying the Word. Therefore more is our duty.

Ans. 1. His Major is undeniable, his Minor is true also, and therefore Excommunication is granted, though not from this text, but what's this argument to prove that those that either refuse to be examined by their Minister and Officers, or upon Examination not satisfying their Minister and Officers in respect of knowledge only, ought to be excluded the Sacrament?

Ans. Indeed all he saith to this, in order to the text, is but this one slender clause, *Now if some separation must be made, then examination*

nation, and such like proper means also, pag. 138.

Though this may be granted in respect of Excommunication, yet this is more then can be concluded from the text in hand, as I have given sufficient hints of already.

His third proof is, 2 *Theff.* 3. 2, 6, 14, 15 verses.

Mr. Saunders saith, *The Apostle speaks of wicked men, vers. 2. which he will have noted, (vers. 14) that is censured, as is plain, &c.* In the 2. vers. he gives a character of some false brethren, unreasonable wicked men; then a command, vers. 6. to withdraw, and after to have no company, vers. 14. which by the following words we are constrained to understand of some exclusion from fellowship in some Ordinances, &c.

1. If those unreasonable wicked men were of the Church and Brethren, which the Apostle desires the Church to pray that he may be delivered from in respect of his safety, then surely they deserved to be excommunicated and cast out out of all Christian Communion, or else none at all; and if such were the Delinquents writ about, vers. 6. 14. Divines need not fear to say that Excommunication is too much at first (as he) pag. 140. and therefore by his own sense from vers. 2. this text will prove no more but what he always granted, namely excommunication.

Ans

2. If those unreasonable wicked men, there meant, were not of the Church, but persecutors that absurdly hindred the preaching and profession of the Gospel, as all men where the Apostle came amongst, had not faith, but were either Infidels or Apostates, then to what purpose are those directions given to this Church toward such, that were in no capacity to be dealt withall as members in Communion? for they that are without, God judgeth.

3. Suppose one should grant him, that this withdrawing is to be understood of some exclusion from fellowship in some Ordinances, what can hence be concluded for his way? As to examination in respect of knowledge (only), which is the thing in question, as himself hath stated it, pag. 20. These were not excluded any Communion for ignorance, but for disorderly walking. And we allow some examination to finde out offenders in the exercise of discipline; but deny that the Church upon finding her members greatly defective in knowledge; for that she may exclude them from fellowship in some Ordinances, without better proof.

But because both reverend and learned Interpreters are uncertain; and in doubt of the practical part of the Apostles directions as touching the offending Brethren, I shal here contribute that little of my dark apprehensions I have at present towards the searching
after

after the sense of the place. And in so doing three things are to be inquired after especially.

First, The quality or condition of the person.

Secondly, The nature of the sin.

Thirdly, The remedy prescribed to reform the sinner.

In the first there is no difficulty at all, that the Apostle meant a brother, one that was within, and a Christian, all agree: so as touching the nature of the sin writ about it is clear enough. (How Mr. *Saunders* should be so wide is to be admired, in applying the remedy to wrong persons, vers. 2.) It's certain the fault or sin intended was this, there was one, or some of that Christian Church that altogether neglected the workes of their particular calling, and lived in idlenesse, not working at all, vers. 11. and not only so, but that such were guilty of that common vice, that alwayes attends idle persons, they were (busie bodies) in the same verse, and this is usual when a mans minde is not taken up in some lawful calling, he is subject to those temptations; for want of businesse of his own, he will busie himself with other mens, and for want of necessities of his own, which idlenesse brings upon him, he is ready to thrust in where he can, and backbite, flatter, invent tales, tending to the disquiet and contention of the places where

such are, this seems to be intimated, ver. 12. In the first part of the remedy he command^{ing} them in the authority of Christ, that with quietnesse they work, eating their own bread, yet they might the rather be gently dealt with, because they having newly received the knowledge of Christian hope of eternal life by him, they might be so taken with this mercy, that it might take some off from their necessary occasions, and make them think that they should alwayes be talking and speaking of the things of Christ, they not considering the inconveniences that would follow thereupon, not only the burdening of the Church, but giving an occasion of the growth, and putting forth such vitious corruptions (hinted at before) that the corrupt nature of all men are more or lesse inclined unto.

The remedy prescribed consists of several parts, I shall but touch at things.

A command in a double respect.

The first was when he was with them in person, vers. 10. and this ran upon a penalty, *This we commanded you; that if any would not work, neither should he eat:* notwithstanding this charge the Church was carelesse and remisse in putting this into execution, and did relieve them, and too much countenance them in that disorderly course, insomuch that some complaint was made against the thing. *For we hear, saith the Apostle, that there*

are

are some that walk disorderly, not working at all, &c. vers. 11. and in order to this sinful connivence of the Church, he layes a strict injunction in the authority of Christ upon the Church to withdraw from such, vers. 6. in respect of civil familiarity and maintenance according to their charge, as before.

He repeats the command again in his absence, and that in the authority of Christ, and in positive terms; *That with quietnesse they work, and eat their own bread*, vers. 12. and further tells them, if any one shall refuse to be obedient according to this Epistle, the Church should note them, by some sign of distinction, declining that wonted and friendly familiarity as to others that lived orderly; and so doing, would be a means to bring them into some shame, and amendment, and clear the Church of the guilt of such disorders; I mean the Church in general. Besides I should have taken notice how the Apostle presseth upon them his own practice when he was amongst them, vers. 7, 8, 9. for the Apostles they wrought with labour, &c. but not because they had not power and liberty to forbear working, but to make themselves an example unto all in the Church to follow them: and that they might not be chargeable to any.

2.

But last of all, lest the Church should run on the other hand into too much severity, and in stead of healing and amending of
the

the offender, destroy and loose him, by expelling him out of their society, as they would an enemy, the Apostle puts in a moderate caution, *yet count him not as an enemy, (or Infidel, as we judge of one that is Excommunicate) but admonish him as a brother, (or one within) under a more gentle cure.* So that I conceive the most severity here intended, was to decline all friendly fellowship with them, by withdrawing their friendly countenance and kindenesse, and rather to reprove and admonish them, for their amendment; this seems to be but a particular drawn from a more general rule, *Ephes. 5. 11. Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darknesse, but rather reprove them, nor partake in other mens sins.*

But Mr. Saunders saith, *This sense that I pitch upon in respect of the penalty is too little, as Excommunication is too much :* quoting Erasmus, pag. 140. he saith further, *it must be such a noting and withdrawing, as tends to the saving and reforming of scandalous and misliving brethren; suspension from civil society is lesse shaming.*

Answ.

1. They may doe well to give some reasons, why the declining all friendly familiarity in respect of civil courtesies, and charity, is too little to bring such brethren to shame, considering those times, and of what necessity it was of to have the love and furtherance of the Church; all Christians being so lyable persecutors, unlesse they were such

such that would revolt from their Christian profession upon the least danger.

2. The punishment in a civil sense was so sharp, that had all in that Church but done their duty, in putting it into execution, the offender must either have reformed, or have been pined to death, or forsake the Church; for every member was under an Apostolical command, If any would not work, neither should he eat, had the whole together, or a part made conscience of their duty, they might have humbled the proudest, and brought them under some yoke or other I warrant you.

3. If this was too little for scandalous misliving brethren, as he saith, then why is not suspension from the Lords Supper too little; especially where most in a Church are upon the matter suspended, as with them of their way? many of which are neither ignorant nor scandalous, nor any way of a misliving course, and can it be imagined that any that are scandalous misliving brethren should ever be brought to shame by keeping them from the Sacrament (only), when so many of them that are brethren of honest and good repute are kept away as well as the other. It's both a vain and absurd thing to pretend to the right means to reform; and yet so to use them as to be certainly disappointed of the end. Nay where such reforming as theirs is once in acting, what's

what's the event and end, or fruit that follows, but strife and debate, contention, division, prejudices, back-biting, quarreling and questioning what such a Minister preaches, with derision and confusion, and such like desperate fruits, as experience doth daily shew.

4. If excommunication be too much for scandalous misliving brethren, that would not reform, as is supposed of these in the text, why then it will follow as before, that none ought to be excommunicate at all, for none can be worse in the Church then scandalous misliving brethren, sure, that will not reform.

But to come to this argument in the close of this Mr. *Saunders* forms it up thus;

Noting offending brethren so as to shame them, is holy and necessary. But such is our suspension of misliving men. Therefore holy and necessary.

Answ.

How wide his Major is from the text needs no great discovery to the Judicious, but for the sake of the weak, and lesse intelligent Reader something should be done. Had the Apostle writ to the Church to take any course they could devise to bring these disorderly brethren unto shame, then his Major had been tolerable, but when the Church is directed to the particular way and means to bring such to shame, as in the text; and the Church to invent some other wayes drawing

a general from a particular is evill : if any kinde of noting will but shame them, (then it's holy and necessary) from this text, it would as well follow, that the stocks or pillory is so to note offending brethren as to shame them, therefore holy and necessary from this text; what may not then be assumed to be holy and necessary, if it will but shame men? But I have shewn above that their way brings none to shame, and therefore hath not the least colour of warrant from the text. The Lord give them hearts to consider of it.

His fourth proof to prove examination a necessary duty unto admission to the Lords Supper, is 1 Cor. 5. 11. *If any man that is called a Brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, drunkard, &c. with such one no not to eat.*

If we take not to eat in a civil sense, then they raise their argument from the lesser to the greater.

2. *If we take it for Sacramental eating, then we have an Apostolical injunction against the coming of the ungodly ones to the Lords Table : and by consequence an allowance of separation, as to such, and of tryal in order to it, pag. 141, 142.*

1. You shall see what himself saith in answer to all this, in that which follows in the same page.

1. The whole chapter concerns Church-fellowship & censures. It is about casting out of the incestuous person, as every one sees : Doe not we judge them that are within, put
away

away from among you that (or the like) wicked person. Again, he saith that the nature of the recited sins, vers. 11. shew that he intends scandals calling for discipline and coming under the like censure with incest; thus far himself, pag. 143. And therefore from his own sense of the context I conclude that this text allows of no other separation in the Church, but what is made by Juridical Excommunication; for doubtlesse the incestuous person was only so separated from the fellowship of the Church: and this is the same which I alwayes plead for and would have reformation begin withall. Let him draw what consequence he can from his own sense of the text for their separation, when he confesses in another place that they excommunicate none.

By this the intelligent and sober may know what to judge of the way he defends, that is so point blank to his own quotations: for in the text reforming the scandalous in the Church is onely by Excommunication; and they excommunicate none, but separate from their Churches, leaving the infectious and diseased to cure themselves; or perish for them, by neglecting those due and necessary Ordinances appointed for their amendment: but in my answer to Mr. *Collings* I have spoke largely to this Scripture, whither I shall refer you,

His

His fifth proof is *Matth.* 7. 6. but I cannot conceive he doth draw any thing from it at all in proof of the question in hand, and I having largely spoke to it in my answer to Mr. *Collings*, it's needlesse to repeat: besides, I have answered to more difficulties from Mr. *Collings*, then is urged by Mr. *Saunders*.

So also his sixth proof, *1 Cor.* 11. 27. to the end, is fully answered, no more need be added untill what I have writ in my answer to Mr. *Collings* be thoroughly answered and confuted. All that I can finde of Mr. *Saunders*, amounts but to this; If self-examination be necessary to goe before receiving, then such as doe not, or cannot, ought to be excluded. And hence they will inforce it the duty of all to be examined, that they may know who are able to examine themselves; and those that upon this search they finde not capable, exclude them.

It concerns them, 1. To prove what every one is to examine himself of from the text. *Ans.*

2. To determine of the lowest degree of what is necessary to receiving or excluding in respect of every member.

3. To prove that unlesse the private be so done at least the publick ceaseth to be their duty; but certainly I judge that those that are under the actual obligation of self-examination are under the actual obligation of
of

I grant the
Word
doth ju-
stifie the
necessity
of those
things he
lays down,
and are
the duties
of all
Christi-
ans. But
deny that
these
things are
to be ap-
plied to
qualifie,
persons
for the
Sacra-
ment,

of receiving; for the Church of *Corinth* was commanded both: and sure both were the duty of all her members of years: however denied to ours by the Author. The qualifications in order to receiving laid down by Mr. *Saunders*, pag. 171. 172. 173. are such, that had he not forsaken his Pastoral charge, and joyned himself to another Church, before he had been able to prove the least particular there confidently affirmed; he should never have runned into that needlesse exorbitant separation while he had lived. But this is that which undoes them, first they fancy to themselves a false sense of some Scriptures, and then draw a multiplication of far fetcht consequences from it too, and by this means run themselves in to an *infinitum* of mischievous errors, to the Churches prejudice and trouble. And truly I cannot but admire at the wisdome and providence of God only wise, that hath by strange workings made void from time to time what hath been prepared in order unto the exercise of discipline; I doubt not but when our principles are more the minde of Scriptures in regard of the blessed and priviledged state of the whole visible Church in Covenant relation with God, the Lord will favour us in his great kindenesse, by putting the poore despised Church of the Nation into a possession of that discipline that is most the minde of Jesus Christ revealed

vealed in the Word. In the mean time we have all need to pray much, for we are under an hour of temptation, and many are scared by it.

I come to his seventh proof, pag. 148. *1 Tim. 5. 22. Neither be partakers of other mens sins.* The sum of what he saith to this, was not enough for a Minister to give the unworthy warning of the danger, or to reprove and denounce Gods judgements against the impenitent to free him from other mens sins.

This may clear him as a Preacher, but not as a Ruler or Steward, for if the same Minister shall loose the same men by giving them the seals of the New Covenant, which is to tell them that they are interested in Gospel priviledges and promises, he fears that the guilt that was thrust out of the fore doore, comes in again at the back doore.

1. The main of the question lies in this, whether the Minister admits any such who are by the Authority of Scriptures forbid to come, he not doing what he regularly may to exclude them. I shall easily grant that a Minister through carelesnesse and unfaithfulnesse may be involved in the guilt of their peoples sins, as touching the Sacrament; but the question is, when a Minister hath laboured to instruct his people, and hath given warning of the danger of eating and drinking unworthily, and hath stirred

Answe.

them up to come reverently and orderly, carrying themselves futable to the external actions there required, hath not done his duty in an Evangelical sense, as to that of his, that every Minister is a Ruler, and therefore to urge upon them acts of discipline, and Jurisdiction as a Ruler, when the whole Church is without discipline, is such a boldnesse, that never any pretending to sober principles assumed, (untill these exorbitant times we are fallen into) for want of holy discipline.

But he grants that in respect of all, the Minister doing his duty as before, is clear as a Preacher. And that is sufficient from his own mouth to justify those that dare assume no other power in the Church at present, but what they have by vertue of their Ministerial Office. And as Stewards they are bound to be faithful in the dispensing of that, leaving the issue to the blessing of their Master. And it concerns Mr. Saunders to prove himself a Ruler, and impowered with the actual exercise of the Keyes of Jurisdiction in his Church, before he take upon him to binde and loose at his pleasure; if he be so impowered, why doth he not reform his own Congregation, and administer all the Ordinances in his own Church? Why doth he not by his authority convent the scandalous before him, and admonish, rebuke, Excommunicate, without any fear or scruple,

scruple, and practise all Church Communion in all the Ordinances to the other not at all under his censure? Will he blame another in that which he neglects himself? If there be none in his Congregation over whom he rules, lyable to his censures to command them, why doth he neglect to administer the holy Sacrament unto them? If there be scandalous members in his Church, why doth he connive at their wickedness, and suffer himself to be leavened by his carelesse indulgence towards them, partaking of their sins, so far as he neglects the only means to reform them by Juridical Excommunication, 1 Cor. 5. If he say, he keeps them from the Sacrament, I answer, But the Church of Corinth were commanded to do more; Was it ever read of in the Scripture, that a Pastor refused to administer the holy Supper to his flock to keep the scandalous from communicating with them? What thought you plead but for Suspension, ought not that to be Juridical as you are a Ruler empowered so to act? And have you so proceeded with all your people that are excluded the holy Supper? I pray you Sir, satisfy me in these things, either by some Scripture grounds, or by your Reformation as you are a Christian and a Minister of the holy Gospel. As to the rest of this Paragraph, I wish you would better study the nature of the New Covenant, and whom it respects.

And how the Sacraments may be said to be seals thereof, and what they seal to in the Covenant, which things I have insisted somewhat upon in my other writings, both in answer to Dr. Drake and Mr. Collins, whither I refer you, intending hast at present.

In his next Paragraph he speaks to the text in hand, *The Apostle speaks of Ordination of Ministers, wherein by not examining the persons to be ordained guilt is contracted ordaining without proving, as 1 Tim. 3. 10. is too sudden so likewise the giving of the Sacrament is sudden and guilty* (though but once in a year) where no difference or tryal is made of them that come but he that will, though of the basest of the people may be a guest at the Lords Table. Men may put all this off, by thinking the fault is not theirs while the act is others mens, but others mens sins may be oyn. As in civil Judicatories there are principals and accessories: So before God there will be too: and non-examiners are accessories before the fact: thus far he, p. 150

Ans.

This text is quoted either for illustration, or probation of the thing in question: If but for illustration, then it's not argumentative, and the inference but begged. If for proof of the thing in question, the consequence must be this, as the Presbytery is guilty of others mens sins, when they ordain into the Ministry, (suddenly) without tryal of their gifts and life, so in like manner those Ministers are guilty of others mens sins that receive al to the Sacrament without Examination. To this I answer, by pleading *non-sequitur*: it remains for him to prove the necessity of the latter equal

equal with the former; let the like proof and reason be given for the one as the other, they being of themselves things distinct to each other, and different things in the premises will not bear the same conclusions: And therefore that which the text intends I grant; but deny the other untill further proof. And for his distinction in principals, and accessories in sin. And *non-examiners* are accessories before the fact. Still the question is but beg'd, it's still to prove that examination is the duty of every Minister in order to excluding the ignorant, &c. his distinction holds only in those sins or actions that are absolutely forbid, in that which is sin in its own nature; but I deny that giving and receiving the Sacrament is so to baptized Christians of years, and of the Church. I have sufficiently proved that to be their necessary duty, which will not be answered these two dayes. And untill that be answered, the argument doth reflect upon themselves; not only by being accessories of their peoples neglects of institute worship; but being principals of inforcing those neglects of necessary worship groundlessly hindering those that would.

1. You must prove that the baptized rational members of the Church, if ignorant, and in some things offensive, are forbid the Lords Supper, and yet stand bound as members to all other observances of worship.

X 3

2. That

2. That a scandalous member indulged leavens the Church by doing lawful and religious actions commanded.

3. That the prime end in casting out the scandalous & obstinate, is to keep them from the Sacrament mainly; I say that which leavens a Church, is to connive at the scandalous, by not doing what they are in a capacity to doe in acts of severe censures to reform them, it being far from my heart to think that the good actions of a scandalous brother indulged doth leaven the whole, but his evill actions not punished with severity of discipline according unto rule. But why the Church should be leavened more by the admission of such to the Sacrament, then to holy prayer, &c. is to me a myserie, because the Scriptures are clear both in commanding spiritual qualifications in order to prayer, and forbidding the evill; and yet are silent as to these in order to the Sacrament.

2. It cannot be denyed but the Sacraments are the most carnal Ordinances in the Gospel Church, consisting of external matter, that more suites with our bodily senses then any other.

And lastly the weaknesse of their argument, that cry up the holy Supper above her fellows in the Church with the mischievous effects that follow thereupon inevitably. Yet notwithstanding (to prevent mistake) I judge the

the Lords Supper equal in dignity and holiness, with the rest of holy appointments in the Church, as being holy in respect of the holiness of the Author, institution, use, and ends, requiring as much of preparation, reverent approaches, and divine adoration in this part of sacred Worship, as any other part of worship prescribed.

His eight and ninth proofs are *Heb. 13. 17.*
1 Pet. 3. 15. pag. 151.

Obeys them that have the rule over you, &c. be ready to give an answer to every one, that asketh a reason of the hope that is in you.

The sum of that in Peter is but this, he saith, If this were to be given before an enemy, then much more, and easier is it to be made before friends, such as desire to be helpers of mens faith, not upbraidors of their weakness.

The Author shews some ingenuity upon this text, as if he were tender of wresting the sense: he yeelds it concerns Christians under the tyranny of persecutors to be constant in their profession, and therefore waves the consequence he had a minde to. He doth not say, if to enemies, then much more it's your duty as Christians to make profession of your faith and hope before friends as necessary to admission to the Sacrament. Which he should had the text been for his purpose. But he saith, if this were to be given before an enemy, then much more, and easier is it to be made before friends. So that here he insinuates

Ans.

nuates by way of motive as helping their faith, &c. and I dare say it will be sooner yielded unto upon that score, then upon the account of a necessary duty; and I shall highly honour those that are endeavouring to their utmost to draw on all their people to some profession of faith or other, provided they doe it to no other ends, but to help forward the weak and ignorant in faith and knowledge, without the least infringement of the priviledges of the Ordinances in the Church, they stand bound to observe as they are professing Christians. But for men to urge it as a necessary duty in the name of Christ, when he never commands it at all to any such end, they pretend, that is in order to admission to and exclusion from the Sacrament, is that which I think my self bound to oppose as superstitious, pernicious, and tyrannical in the Church of Christ. And I doubt not but to make it good against all those that will acknowledge the constitution and form of our Church to be true at present, though in some things out of order. I confesse my expressions may be judged too harsh, but I hope you will a little bear with my zeal, it being in the behalf of the Church, defending their just rights against those that thing they doe well to degrade them of the same.

That of *Heb. 13. 17.* doth now come to be spoken to, *Mr. Saunders* observes;

1. That

1. That the people under them must be ruled and governed by them.

2. Ministers must give an account of them, which cannot be well done without taking knowledge of their estates.

3. They must not only preach and exhort, but doe all else which may conduce to the peoples salvation.

4. If people obey not (their Rulers in the Church) they hurt themselves two wayes.

1. By sinning against this command.

2. By sadding their Pastors hearts, and so lessening their profit by his Ministry. All these are applicable to our purpose urging activity on the Ministers as well in discipline, as in preaching, calling for compliance from the people.

To his 1. wherea Church is so happy, as *Ans. 1.* to have regular Rulers, chosen by the whole, and set a part to exercise holy discipline Authoritatively, I grant that not only the people, but every Minister ought to be ruled and governed by them, in all lawful and profitable things; but I deny that in the want of such Rulers and government, any Minister or Ministers, by vertue of that Function alone, may assume to themselves an authoritative power to exercise acts of Jurisdiction over their people, although the people out of ignorance should desire it.

I grant that the people should be obedient to their Ministers in the religious carrying

ing of that Ministerial work, according to Gospel rule; but I deny that the Apostle intended the peoples obedience to every fancy that some have the boldnesse in these times to urge upon their people, to their great prejudice and spiritual hurt in debarring them some necessary duty and Covenant blessing. Therefore as children unto parents, so people unto their Pastors must be obedient, in all things, but with this restriction, in the Lord, for this is right, *Ephes. 6.7.*

To his second, *Ministers must give an account of them, which cannot well be without taking knowledge of their estates.*

Ans. 1. He doth not keep to the terms of the text. The Apostle doth not say that, Ministers must give an account of their people, (whether they be good or bad, profitable or unprofitable): but he saith, for they watch for your souls as they that must give an account, that they may doe it with joy, and not with grief, &c. The sense is this, they must perform all necessary duties belonging to their Office towards you, as such that must give an account to God of their being diligent and faithful in the work they are sent to perform: therefore he would have the people to be willing and obedient unto them, for their encouragement in the work, that they may do it with joy, &c. 'Tis certain, both Minister and people must give an account to God; The
Minister

Minister of his faithful discharge [of his duties in relation to his people, and the people of theirs accordingly. For if souls miscarry for his unfaithfulness in not warning them of the danger, they make themselves guilty of the blood of souls, otherwise doing their duty faithfully, they are free from the blood of all.

But Mr. *Saunders* would have it thus, That Ministers must give an account of the state and condition of their people, I think; or if he mean, they must take knowledge of their spiritual estates, that they may know how to apply themselves toward them both in private and publick with seasonable words, &c. in reference to their own account: I see no great hurt in that; nor doth it prove any such thing the text is quoted for. But if he should argue as some others doe from this text, Ministers must give an account to God of their people, therefore the people must give an account of themselves to their Ministers.

Answe. 1. As before by denying 'the antecedent as respecting their personal condition, whether regenerate or not, or whether they have profited or not, but of their own duty in respect of their peoples good.

2. Grant it, as 'themselves would, the consequence is not clear, because a Ministers account unto God, and a peoples account to

to their Minister stand at so great a distance, so wide a difference. But why should this be required of the people more in order to the Sacrament, then Prayer, or in respect of their Salvation? Prove that the Minister is to give an account to God only, how he prepares, and whom he admits to the Sacrament, restraining the Text to that particular only.

But the text he saith is for their purpose, *Because it urgeth to activity in discipline, as in preaching, and calling aloud for compliance from the people.*

Ans.

1. Grant it true, what he saith, it urgeth to activity in discipline, then it must be supposed that the Church thus writ unto was in, actual possession of Ecclesiastical Rulers, and holy discipline. But doth it hence follow, that they themselves are such Rulers, and impowered with the exercise of holy discipline? I think no, without better proof; Try how you can prove, that the exercise of discipline is an inseparable power of every Minister; and that he is as much bound to draw out this power into act at all times, as his preaching power; if so,

1. Then the Church cannot be said to be undisciplined at all, so long as she hath Ministers, but all the fault lies in this, the Ministers negligence in not exercising acts of Jurisdiction, as he is bound to doe, and impowered with.

2. Then

2. Then a Minister is absolute and independent of himself, and not accountable to any Church power in his male-administrations of that power, but to Jesus Christ alone.

3. Then all have this power that are Ministers, and so at liberty to act as their several humors move them, and must be left to this liberty as they are Ministers, being once ordained, but who can be so blinde as not to see into what a gulf of division, tyranny, and confusion, that error, if put into practice, would involve the whole? And most miserable is the condition of those people, that are oppressed with Ministers of such impudent insolent principles, when drawn in to act. It concerns the Christian Magistrate to relieve such a people.

But to proceed to his next, called the 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. proofs, pag. 153. from *Levit. 13. 5. 2 Chron. 23. 19. Joel 3. 17. Nabum 1. 15. Zach. 14. 21.* For the two first, he pleads an equity in them, which is argumentative, The three last, he saith, are against the impure and horrid mixtures, which in our dayes are without sufficient check in most Assemblies.

Do but read read over his quotations, and you will be able to answer him your selves. *Ans.*

His 1. speaks of the uncleannesse of Leprosie, and how he was to be shut up seven dayes, now during this time he could come to no Ordinances, therefore ignorant persons in

in the Gospel Church must not come to the Sacrament, a goodly equitable consequence indeed. But I have been large in confuting the same in my answer to Mr. Collings, whither I refer the Reader, as also his

2. Is there fully spoken to. His last three are so impertinent, that it is but lost labour to repeat the texts, for they are special promises peculiar to the Jews, upon their return from the *Babylonish* captivity.

1. The Temple should be built again, and no more be defiled with the uncircumcised Heathen. And this he applyes to us, as if the unregenerate, ignorant, and offending brethren that are of the Church were meant to be these uncircumcised Heathens, aliens and strangers, that pollute the Churches Communion now, as they the holy Temple and Sanctuary then: though himself doth grant ours to be within, and of the Gospel Church, and their children (holy federally) by vertue of the Covenant; but this is so absurd that it tires me, I having spoke so much to this already.

But he saith, God hath promised this happiness unto his people under the Gospel, that there shall come no more in to them the uncircumcised and unclean.

Now if strangers, men of Belial not enduring the yoke of Christ shall still be mixed with Gods people; How is this promise made good? he asks.

This

Answ.

This promise *Isai. 52. 1.* was made directly to the Jews Church after their return from their captivity, and by the uncircumcised and unclean, is meant Heathenish uncleanness, they should no more invade their land, and defile holy things as before. But I never was acquainted with any such promise as himself tells his Reader of, made to Gospel times, that there should be no strangers in his sense and meaning, that is, no scandalous sinners in the visible Church; no tares among wheat, no mixture of good and bad. I would have him shew us such a promise as that, and that it respects the Gospel Church at all times, and in every place where God hath his Church: which is necessary to make good, or else how can our Author apply it to this period of time, and to our Church in particular.

Besides 1. How doth it call into question all Churches of the Gospel, that ever were? for there were scandalous and wicked persons in them all.

2. It's inconsistent with the wisdom and pleasure of God, who hath constituted the Church in such mercy and grace, that all that are born in the Church are of the Church; and is it likely that such admission did intend such a purity; all being so corrupt by nature as the Church maintains?

3. The very Ordinances set up in the Church

Church to convert, the promises made to the Church in order to that end: and our own experience of some fruit thereof, may discover the vanity of that conceit, (namely, that there shall be no regenerate or wicked in the Church). And he that shall resist such manifest demonstration, I think he understands but little of the truth and nature of the Gospel Covenant, and the blessings of grace and mercy that are conferred upon sinners in the Church from it. I pray you Sir, why is it not Gospel-like for sinners in the Church, to partake of all Gospel Ordinances of Worship? What is the Gospel it self, but good news to sinners? And what do all the Ordinances tend to, but to bring sinners home to God? And I hope he is no enemy to holiness, as our Author intimates pag. 154. that would have Ministers to allow Jesus Christ the liberty of his own appointments in the Church to unite unto himself all those he dearly loves and dyed for.

But Mr. Saunders tells us, *That God looks now for a more real and spiritual people, and will not own such for his people that are gracelesse, whatever their profession may be,* quoting Camero.

Ans.

But what a strange assertion is this, and how derogatory to the Gospel Covenant, and diminishing the grace and goodness thereof to sinners in the Church who are the people of God, (and holy federally) by birth

birth as himself confesseth! And will God now disown them for his people that are gracelesse by nature? then we may cast all Infants out of the Church, and so from baptism: For it will hardly be made good that Infants by nature have real inherent grace: then what hope is there left for gracelesse professing people under the Ordinances? if God will not own such, they are left destitute of all hope; for who can own God, and come to him by the power of Grace, untill the Lord own them for his people by giving them that grace first? But what reason can any of sober principles give, that God will not now in the Gospel times own such a gracelesse professing people for his people, as he hath done before the coming of Christ in the flesh?

For 1. Is not Jesus Christ the Author and procurer of all spiritual blessings to saln man, and always the same, yesterday, to day, and for ever?

2. And was not the Gospel Covenant, (as to the substance of it) alwayes the same to the visible professing Church and to their seed? Is it straightned in respect of grace and mercy towards man since the coming of our Lord, more then before? Or doth it run upon such terms now, as that not any may come under the outward administration that have not real grace? Or will you have none come under Gospel worship

and duties, that professe Christianity, that have not real grace? What rocks doth that assertion dash against?

3. Is not the visible Church the same, all being grafted into the same Olive and Vine, and planted together into the same body by baptism, as the Jew by circumcision? Doe you think that a different administration only made such a different Church, and consequently requires such a different subject in admission into it, as yours imports? What was there in the old administration that should in reason indulge so great a latitude as to the subjects, more then in the new? Those that can tell us wherein the mystery of this lies, should doe well to give us the discovery; for my part, I must confesse, I judge both the Old and also the New, meerly external, as in the letter, both fitted for reasonable man, as instrumental to convey a blessing of grace unto whom the Lord will, of those that in obedience yeeld what homage they are able unto their Lord. Who-soever entered this great Covenant of grace, that the visible Church alwayes hath, and is in possession of, came alwayes under the restitution thereof as his duty, which is this, to observe and doe all that the Lord requires to be done at that time and age that any person lives in, so shall ye be his people, and the Lord will be your God. The Lords Covenant with his Church doth alwayes

ways oblige those that have entred into it, to all that obedience that at present is in force by the Lord. A *Jew* by nature was under all that God commanded them, and a Christian by nature is under all that God commands now. A *Jew* by nature and profession had all the Church priviledges of a *Jew*. In like manner, a Christian by nature and profession hath all the Church priviledges of a Christian, only with greater advantage, forasmuch as the priviledges of the Christian Church are more clear and spiritual, tending more unto the spiritual profit and edification of the whole. And what reason, besides the good pleasure of God, can any man give why the Lord should vary in these different administrations? Most certain it is, that since Christ was manifested in the flesh, and justified in the Spirit, and ascended into glory, greater hath been the advantage both of knowing and believing in the Son of God, in comparison of attaining unto knowledge and faith in Christ, by those that had but some darke obscure discoveries of him by types and shadows; for men now to say that God looks for more at our hands then of them, is rational. But to affirm that the Lord in Gospel times will not own a Christ-professing people that have not real grace, is altogether groundlesse, and a little too peremptorily spoken, without better proof then *Camere*. And it's too harsh to affirm

that a meer want of real grace doth dis-
 covenant a Christian professing people, and
 that God will disown them for his people
 upon that account, they being holy fede-
 rally by birth, and upon that account bap-
 tized, and thereby put in possession of the
 Sacramental Seal, which himself will grant.
 And would the same men but argue as ra-
 tionally from the state of the *Jews* Church,
 as touching grown ones, as they doe of In-
 fants, this Controversie about who shall be
 admitted to the Sacrament would have been
 frivolous.

But now Mr. *Saunders* hath done with the
 texts which he saith *Conclude positively* for
 their practice in gathering and distinguishing their
 Communicants, by examining. *What all these*
lights will doe being set up together, who knows?

Ans. I. So likewise, I have now done with ex-
 amining of what you have concluded from
 these severall texts for your way, and I hope
 I have given both your self and every so-
 ber unprejudiced reader clear and rational
 demonstrations, that there is not so much as
 one of these 15. texts that will prove exam-
 ination a necessary duty unto the Lords
 Supper, as it's stated. Nor hath Mr. *Saunder*
s so much as applyed them (for the most
 part) to prove the question. So little is his
 own confidence of the pertinentnesse of his
 own quotations; for some of them he hath
 applyed to prove suspension, and others to
 prove

prove excommunication, which in order to their way of gathering they meddle not with at all; nor is it proper so to doe in the way they have designed; their way being rather to admit unto membership, then the exclusion of Church-members from the privileges of the Church they have formed. But Sir, how doubtfully doe you expresse your self at last, as if your self were in some doubt whether these texts make for your way or not, *What they may doe, who knowes?* and yet in the beginning of the same sentence you say, *they conclude positively for your practise.*

I may well assure you (Sir) that it's a grief to my Spirit, that such sober godly moderate Gentlemen as your self seems to be, should ingage in a practice before you could tell how to make it out by the authority of holy Scriptures against all the world. Had you been so happy as first to have seen an undoubted warrant, before you had ingaged in this separation, you should never have been one in that society, whilst you had lived. How an ingenuous and rational head can withstand such plain demonstrations, that by the assistance of the Lord I have expressed my self in, in opposing yours; and indeavouring to give the true sense of the Scriptures in debate, I cannot tell; I must and doe commend all that is written to the powerful working of the Spirit of Truth and Grace, to perswade

and incline the hearts of the godly, to see where truth and the Churches peace and reformation lies, according to plain and evident rule. I doubt not but your own heart will bear me witnesse, that I have rationally discovered the most (if not all) your consequences and conclusions as applyed to defend your practice, to be meer mistakes and impertinent. I beseech you consider seriously, how ever you will be able to give the Church of God satisfaction, for running into such a needlesse separation that is altogether without Scripture warrant. Nay, doe but think how you will answer your Lord, for breaking the peace and union of your particular Congregations, raising prejudices, bringing your persons and Ministry into contempt, by making such a groundlesse rent and schism in his Church: and that to the great prejudice of his visible subjects; setting up laws of your own chusing, urging them upon your people as necessary, or else must be excluded, (as to you) the necessary laws of Jesus Christ their absolute Lord. You say well, (as every conscionable sober serious Christian should) that you are ready to stand or fall, as the authority of Scriptures shall determine. In charity I am bound to believe that you intend no lesse then what you have soberly published. Gods providence hath so over-ruled the action, (that one that is a meer stranger unto you; I not so much

much as hearing of your quality, no other-
wise then I can gather by your Book) to give
you a sudden answer, wherein you are now
upon the tryal of your ingenuity and ho-
nesty, there to make good your practice you
are acting vigorously in, or to return to your
own flock, and withhold nothing that is
from them. If you seriously search into
the conditions of your people, I believe you
may see cause to confesse that you have lost
more in your respective flocks, then you are
like to recover while you live; at least some
of you. Please not your selves with what
is so much pretended in this giddy age;
Namely, to act in reforming in some pure
and stricter way. For many have run them
out of all, under such like pretences. Be holy
and strict as it is written according to the
known and undoubted rule of Scripture Ca-
non; and be assured that that's the purest
way, for you know, not our own way, be it
never so specious; but the way of the Lord
is the straight way that leads to life in glory,
and if you return, and be faithful in dispen-
sing the things of God, as you are obliged by
the Word, that's the way that God will own,
the way of the Churches peace and edificati-
on; the way to make Ministers a blessing to
their people, and their people a blessing un-
to them: and the only way both to unite and
to reform the whole. The Lord give you a
heart to be serious and searching after the

safest way, in the further discharge of those relative duties, as Pastor of a Congregation, whom you are set to watch over, and warn and feed also in the Lord.

I must confesse unto you, that I have been something more round and rude in my answer then is so well becoming; considering the moderate temper of our Author. But the Lord is my record, that I have not any slight esteem of his person; but am verily perswaded he is a precious, able, sober, Divine, that expresses much of true godlinesse in him. It is partly the want of some easier & smooother expression; partly my zeal of the Churches peace, so miserably plunged into divisions and separations, the great impediments to reformation; partly because I would provoke to more searching into this Controverlie about admission to, & exclusion from the Sacrament; for I see that our over rigid principles in this, doe run us upon other dangerous rocks. Partly to vindicate my self, and those of the same perswasion from what we are censured for, by Mr. Manton. But if any thing be inexcuseable, that your charitable construction cannot moderate, I beg your pardon, for I affect not to be bitter, nor would I be guilty of any incivility towards any godly Ministers of the Gospel.

But I shall go on, and come to examine his convincing arguments, laid down as seconds to the Scriptures alleadged, pag. 156. and the first

first is this, *Because the holy Supper belongs to godly ones, real believers: men have a right in Gods fight only as such: They that have no true grace, have a seal set to a blank.* Men stand in the visible Church as they are apprehended to belong to the invisible; *all this, he saith, is soundly proved by our Saviour administering to Disciples only, Matth. 26. 26. not to Disciples in the largest acceptation, for many professed besides: but to such as were more peculiar was it given. And his practise is to be a rule to the Church.*

All Mr. Saunders strength in proof of this *Answ.* argument stands in two things.

1. In his asserting several things that are usually taken for granted, without any special proof.

2. In urging the practise of our Saviour in the first administration, *Matth. 26. 26.* as proving soundly all the particulars asserted in the argument, he denying that this was an accidental circumstance; but was fore-determined by Christ so to have it, but his enumeration of particulars are meerly begged, and argued against in my answer to Mr. Collings, unlesse it be this, that men stand in the visible Church as they belong to the invisible. I know not any ground why we should apprehend that all in the visible Church doe belong to the invisible of Gods Elect: for in the Church amongst them that are called, it's said that *many are called, but few are chosen*; though it's true in a negative sense

sense in this respect of particular persons we cannot exclude any one from Election.

Mr. Saunders argument in form, as to the substance and sense, is thus.

Such only that Christ gave the Sacrament unto, have right to receive it; But he gave it to none but holynes, Disciples by peculiar choyce — Ergo, holynes, disciples by peculiar choyce (only) have right unto it.

Ans.

The argument is so weak and feeble that to the Judicious it needs no answer; but for the help of the weak something would be said.

1. Were there no other Scripture precepts, Precepts, Intimations, for clearing and warranting the right of those that are to be admitted, but the first president argued from; then it would have posed us to answer it; or to prove the continuance of it to the Churches use at all; because at first it was given to extraordinary persons in Office only. But if he will allow the whole of holy Scripture he might see enough to justify the right of all in the Church in general without any peculiar choyse, 1 Cor. 10. 17. *Act.* 2. 42. ch. 20. 7.

2. If this President, *Matth.* 26. 26. were fore-determined by Christ to be an example and rule for the Church; then

1. Who must administer this Ordinance now according to this pattern? Christ himself only blessed, and gave it unto Apostles only.

2. Then

2. Then it will follow, that none but persons in Office, and of the Ministry should receive it.

3. Then the greatest part of sincere Disciples and followers of Christ should be left out; for without doubt there were many such at that present that were not admitted. Besides the seventy Disciples sometimes sent forth to preach the Gospel, there were other holy persons both men and women; the names that presently met together for religious and divine employments were about an hundred and twenty; of whom some choyse persons are named, as *Mary the Mother of Jesus*, and other women, and *Matthias* and *Barabas*, *Act. 1. 14, 15, 23.* which Christ gave not the Sacrament unto: therefore if this president must be our rule, no wonder they refuse as good as they admit, nay better then they admit; for without doubt Christ gave it to some, that afterward discovered great ignorance and unbelief, besides one of them was a Devil.

4. If this president must be our rule as it's urged, then there must be a choyse of some peculiar holy ones, out of holy ones admitted, and as holy and sincere refused. And yet see how the Author prevaricates and departs from this president in another place: where he saith, *Our way is only to exclude the visibly unworthy, and no others*, pag. 166.

3. If all that Christ gave the Sacrament unto were not holy, then the argument will fall of it self; but Christ gave it unto *Judas* whom he knew was a Traytor, and had conspired with other of his enemies to destroy him: therefore all that Christ gave it unto were not holy ones, and so the argument falls. That which is to be made good is the Minor; for indeed some are in doubt whether *Judas* received the Sacrament or no. And therefore I shall a little touch upon that: and it will be made good from *Matth*, 26. 26. his own quotation: in this text, Christ gave the signes of his body and bloud to his Disciples, and said, *Take, eat, this is my Body*; *Judas* was one of his Disciples that sate down at the Table, vers. 20. *When Euen was come, he sate down with the twelve*, and one of this twelve should betray him, vers. 21. and that *Judas* continued at the Supper is evident, vers. 23. *He that dippeth with me in the dish, the same is he.* And *St. Mark* 14. chap. of his Gospel, vers. 17. 20. relates just the same with *St. Matthew*. Then come to *Saint Luke*, chap. 22. 14, 21. he agrees with the former, that all the twelve sate down, and he in special speaks of the actions done at the Table the twelve sate down unto,

Namely, 1. The eating of the Pascheover, vers. 15, 17, 18. Then Christs celebrating this sacred Ordinance, blessing and breaking bread; to be done in remembrance of Christ,

vers.

vers. 19. 20. And now having related the main actions that were performed thus solemnly at the Table, then he relates what words fell out to be spoken at the Table, vers. 21, 22. notwithstanding Christs love in this familiar manner express to them, and theirs to him both in the Passover, and holy Supper; yet Christ tells them that one of them should betray him: and *Luke* you see relates these words as being at the conclusion of those holy appointments of the Passover, and holy Supper. And thus we may conceive a clear agreement of these three Evangelists, that *Judas* was at the Lords Table, and did doe as the other did for any thing in the least hinted at by these three, that wrote first of this holy history. And how ever it should come into the head of any so much as to scruple such a thing, whether *Judas* (one of the twelve that sate and eat at the same Table with Christ and the other,) received the holy Supper or no, especially there being not the least hint of his exclusion or withdrawing more then of the other: is to be admired. Without doubt we may rationally conclude from these three, that *Judas* received the Sacrament of the Lord, as well as *Peter* or *James*, or *Thomas*, &c. for they are not recorded to have received it by name in particular, but as they were his Disciples, and of the twelve, that sate down at the Table. But then you will say, how comes it

to passe, that this of *Judas* receiving or not, is made such a great controversie in the Church in all ages.

Ans. That which hath occasioned this Controversie from the four Evangelists is in *Job. 13. 30.* *Judas* having received the Sop, went immediately out, and it was night, hence it's conceived that *John* hath relation to the Passeever Supper, and this sop was some part of that service, and upon his eating this, the Devil entred, vers. 27. and he went out immediately before the Lords Supper was instituted and given; and brought about his actual treason in a part of that night. This place and sense hath occasioned the question, and quarrel, as to *Judas*, so far as ever I could meet with any colour of reason. Therefore now I shall both briefly and plainly give you my thoughts how to reconcile the Evangelists, and to satisfie any that are rational, I hope.

1. It can never be proved, that *St. John* doth so much as mention, or mean the Passeever Supper in the 13. of *John*, at all, only he gives a more particular account of that Supper, which Christ and his Disciples had together at *Bethany*, two dayes before the feast of the Passeever, in the house of one *Simon* a Leaper, where a woman poured upon Christs head a box of very costly oyntment, &c. all the Evangelists spake of this Supper, *Matth. 26. 2, 6, 7.* *Mark. 14. 1, 3.* *Luk. 21. 1, 3.* *Job. 13.*

1, 2. all the doubt is of this of John, whether it be the same with the other three.

Answer. Consult the words and circumstances, v. 1. *Now before the Feast of the Passover,* &c. Matthew and Mark hath it, *You know that after two dayes is the Feast of the Passover.* Luke upon the same saith, *Now the Feast of unleavened bread drew nigh, which is called the Passover:* thus far you see there is no disagreement; only Matthew and Mark are more punctual for the space of time before (namely) two dayes, then Luke and John.

2. They all agree in this, that Judas began his treason, made his bargain before the Passover night or Supper, 1 Job. 13. 1, 2. compared, *Now before the Feast of the Passover,* and Supper being ended, the Devill having now put into the heart of Judas to betray him. Even now before the Passover came at a private civill Supper in Simon the Leapers house, the Devil first put it into Judas heart to betray him. And then Luke relates the same, chap. 22. 3. & 1. put together. *Now the Feast of the Passover drew nigh. Then entred Satan into Judas, one of the twelve, and he went his way and communed with the chief Priests, how he might betray him unto them. And they were glad and covenanted to give him money, and he promised and sought opportunity to betray him in the absence of the people,* vers. 4, 5, 6. Then after this came the Passover, vers. 7. Thus it is clear the Devil entered into Judas before the Passover Supper.

Supper. Now if the sop *John* spake of, had been at the Passeeover Supper, (which preceded Satans entring and prevailing, putting *Judas* upon treason,) then how will *Luke* be reconciled, and the other, *Matthew* and *Mark*, which spake the very same with *Luke*, And from that time he sought to betray him, *Matth.* 26. 16. that is, after he had made his bargain for thirty pieces of silver, *vers.* 15. all this was done before they went into the City, or could tell where to keep the Passeeover, *vers.* 17, 18. The very same is in *Mark.* 14. 10, 11. Thus far we see an agreement of all the Evangelists, that the Devill entered *Judas*, and he had plotted and contracted the treason before the Passeeover Supper, and therefore this of *John* cannot be meant of the Passeeover night.

1. Because the sop preceding Satans entring was before that night, as *Luk.* 22. 3. is expresse.

2. Because that Supper, *Joh.* 13. 1, 2. was before the Passeeover.

3. Because the sop in *Joh.* 13. 27. was that which did immediately precede Satans entrance, prevailing with *Judas* to betray his Master.

4. Because when after the sop our Saviour saith, *What thou dost doe quickly*, the other Disciples not knowing what it meant, thought because it was spoken to *Judas*, he having the bag, that *Jesus* had bid him buy those

those things that they had need of against the Feast, vers. 28, 29. and therefore it was before the Paschever Feast began, there being no lawful buying and selling, when the Feast of the Paschever was begun. If any shall say, that St. *Mark*, chap. 14. 26. speaks the same with *John*; and it's clear, that of St. *Marks* was spoken in relation to the Paschever Supper, and therefore the dipping a sop in *John* was at the Paschever; for they seem both to relate to the same thing.

Ans. I grant St. *Mark* hath relation to the Paschever Supper, but then I deny that both these dippings were the same, and at the same time. *Marke* saith, *Jesus* said, *Verily I say unto you, one of you that eateth with me shall betray me*, v. 18. Nay *Christ* came nearer; and said it was one of the twelve, that dipped with him in the dish; and so left it in the general amongst them, which caused every one to suspect himself: But this in *John* seems to be a different thing; for this of dipping and giving was occasioned by *Johns* private question, vers. 25. Lord who is it, saith *John*, leaning on *Jesus* breast, (being put on by *Peter* to move the question). *Jesus* gave this sign privately only in answer to *John*; He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it, and he gave it to *Judas*, and said, *What thou dost doe quickly*. This discovered the Traytor unto *John* only; For no man at the Table knew for what intent *Christ* spake thus unto him: this

is a far different thing to that of *Marke*, there one of the twelve, that did eat with him in the same dish which all did, here he it is that Christ gave a sop unto when he had dipped it; there one of the twelve, here which of the twelve; there none could be satisfied who was the Traytor; here *John* only could tell that it was *Judas*, and indeed *John* knew the Traytor, but did not discover him. Many more things might be added, but I have done more then I intended, to clear up the Evangelical Harmony in relation to *Judas* his receiving the Lords Supper. *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, are clear for the affirmative, and *John* you may clearly see in his 13. ch. speaks not at all of the Passeeover Supper, but of that Supper at *Bethany*, which all the other make mention of too as well as he, they larger in relating of some particulars; he of other particulars, for the perfecting of this holy History. Hence it may be clearly concluded that *Judas* received the Sacrament; And they all drunk of it, *Mark*. 14. 23. And now you may easily see what foundation *Mr. Saunders* first convincing argument stands upon, to prove that there should be Examination, and differencing of men in order to Reformation, and preventing unworthy receivers. Christ though he knew *Judas* to be a Devil, and had discovered him to be the Traytor unto *John*, yet he gives both the Passeeover and Sacrament of his

his body and blood to Judas amongst the rest, without any differencing act of exclusion; yet not without telling him smartly of his sin, and the judgements of God ready to follow thereupon; which left him more without excuse.

I come now to his second Argument;

The means and the end come under the same command; Now we finde the end commanded, unworthy ones are forbidden, and denyed. Who will say that Ignorant and scandalous in life are to be admitted? Now this being granted any proper and sufficient way to this end; Namely, the exclusion of the unfit: cannot want a probation from the Word, for the end is attained by means, and is in vain set forth without them, pag. 157.

I grant those that are forbidden to come, *Ans.* there are means to be used to exclude them; but I deny the Minor, that Church-members for ignorance meerly, or scandalous lives are forbidden to come, untill all due means have been used to reform them; as namely, admonition private, and authoritative Excommunication; untill then, I will say all Church-members of years ought to be admitted. That which is the onely thing in question, he would have it granted him; ~~as~~ that unworthy ones, (as he calls them) are forbidden: but who in the Church are they? I would gladly know, the Apostle speaks of some that did eat and drink unworthily: but it doth not follow

therefore that their persons were unworthy, because some of their actions were. I have insisted largely upon this in answer to Mr. Collins. The truth is, how can they be said to be forbidden, that are of the Church and baptized, and as such are under the command of all institute worship? Nay it's a question whether Excommunication doe disoblige from precepts of worship, although the Church may lawfully deny them the benefit of all worship in the punishing of impenitent scandalous sinners for their amendment. A prison doth not excuse a Fellow from duties of publick worship, when he by his own sinning hath brought himself justly under that restraint. And in his saying, Any proper and sufficient way to the exclusion of the unfit. I know no way but Juridical censures of the Church that is proper according to the Gospel rule, Juridical Admonition and Excommunication the Word hath prescribed directly, and that only is proper and sufficient for the exclusion of the unfit; as for any other way to be proper that is no where to be found in the Scripture, and neglect to doe as it is written, is but a raw fancy of a mans own framing, and punishable by the Scriptures, as is clear in the case of Nadab, and Abihu, *Levit. 10. 1, 2.* they invented a proper and a sufficient way in kindling common fire to consume the Sacrifice of Incense, the

the fire of the Tabernacle being out through their own negligence; but the Lord destroyed them with fire from heaven, for presuming to offer that which the Lord commanded not. For where the Lord himself prescribes a way, the Church is bound only to that way, not any way; but that only of Gods own prescribing will he be pleased with. God will be sanctified in them that come nigh him. Now then I say, when we upon Church reforming, through the subtilty of some, and carelesse-nesse of others, have lost the exercise of the Churches discipline: being out of actual possession, through our owne default, as to the edification of the whole, shall any be so bold now, as to invade this authoritative power, and assume to themselves without the consent of the Church the exercise of discipline? and under that pretence use any way that is but proper and sufficient to exclude the ignorant and scandalous from the Sacrament? when the Lord hath prescribed a direct way what is to be done with the scandalous in the Church. Again, that the Ark should be fetched unto its proper place, was an (end) commanded, yet any proper and sufficient means subservient thereunto were not warrantable; but that way and means only that God had appointed: and you know *David* swerved from the prescription in fetching back the Ark, but the Lord made a

breach upon them for it, in smiting *Uz-
zab* that hedged. This way was proper and
sufficient to attain the end, yet they were
punished for it. The Lord made a breach
amongst them, because they carryed not the
Ark according to that order God had pre-
scribed in the Law. It's a dangerous and
desperate attempt to invent ways and means
of exclusion of Christs visible subjects from
their native rights otherwise then it is writ-
ten. There is a clear rule for Juridical Ex-
communication, and in what cases, and
by whom to be exercised; and let that sa-
tisfie all, untill they can finde further or-
der from the Scriptures to warrant their
other proceedings, under the notion of di-
scipline in this giddy age. The Reader may
sufficiently by this see the weaknesse and
vanity of the way and practise defended by
the Author. I have fully answered the
texts of Scripture and the reasons added as
seconds to warrant their way, they must
either finde out a better warrant then is yet
produced; or else as the ten Tribes were
jealous of the other two and a half, *Josh. 22.*
when they heard that the two had erected
an Altar of their own heads, conceived they
were in a superstitious rebellion, in forsake-
ing the wayes of the Lord, and so to pro-
voke the Lord unto anger to punish the
whole Congregation, as in the matter of
Peor and *Achan*; so may we be jealous and
suspicious

suspicious of these new invented wayes, so vigorously acted in by our brethren, which tend so evidently to make division and schism in the Church, and is such an impediment, that doth obstruct and make void all hopes of attaining unto that discipline, that God hath prescribed for the health and welfare of the whole Church. They cannot say as the two Tribes of their Altar, It is not for sacrifice, but for a witnesse to the other Tribes that their children had part in the Lord, and in the Altar that he had commanded to be built for sacrifice and worship. For the way that Mr. *Saunders* defends is for worship, and held forth as necessary, to the prejudice of professing Christians that have any interest in the Lord, and in all his commanded worship that you exclude them from, and upon the matter dis-covenant them, and their children from having a part in the Lord. Doe you think it but a small evill to your professing people to deprive them of the benefit and blessing of Gospel appointments, instituted by the Lord himself for the spiritual good of his visible Church, of which your people are members and within? What know you but it may lye heavy upon your souls, if ever you be reduced into straights and tryals, to think of the wrong you have done to your peoples souls in withholding that from them, which was necessary? You think (now)

the fault is your peoples, and that they keep themselves away from the Sacrament; they may be admitted if they will; for you say it's more for want of a will, then of capacity that they are not admitted. But by your leave Sir, may I presume to speak one word on the peoples behalf? you impose such laws and ties upon their consciences in order to admission, that you cannot in the least make good by the authority of your Master, you pretend very much to his authority in those very things, which are meerly your own fancies, and inconsistent with your own principles otherways. I dare boldly say that you are in such a way, (and stickle to defend it too) that you will never while you live be able to produce one plain text of Scripture, (allowing it its own sense) to justify either the forming of your Church, or to prove any one thing of what you stand upon as necessary to admission; you have quoted 15. texts to prove ex-amination, and suspension only, and not one will in the least favour you as hath bin discovered already, and in your laying down necessary things to qualify unto receiving, you quote about sixty texts; and I have searched biter them, I dare say it and justify it too, that there is not one text of all that number in the least pertinent to prove any one of the qualifications, as laid down to be necessary to this end; namely, to admission to the
holy

holy Supper. And how would you have your people to come up to your terms, when you so evidently wrest the sense of Scriptures to justify the boldness of venting forth your own fancies in the name of the Lord? This is the way you are agreed of, and you rejoice in your comforts, and applaud it for purity, and you are resolved thus to walk, and you cry up Gospel rule: and yet your actions are not consonant to any rule the Scripture teach; for any thing you have said in defence of your way. May not your comforts be suspected, as well as others, whose wayes and courses are dangerous, and to be avoided? I would have you consider of it, for these unnecessary separations in a true Church, (as you confesse of ours) are absolutely schismatical: and your people are bound to decline your way, and to keep their station in the Church into which they are imbodyed, and to use all their indeavours to partake of Gods Ordinances where they may, without running themselves into such dangerous schisms that directly tend to the confusion of the whole. And without doubt if you will be as ingenuous as you expresse, you must either return to your distracted flocks and perform those relative duties you stand bound unto, or persist in wayes of your own choosing, meerly without the words warranty, which is scandalous in the Church of Christ,

so

so to doe and deserves to be censured.

Mr. *Saunders* after his arguments, he gives some motives which he would have his Reader lay to heart the evils following the neglect of them, or the like course.

1. *And chiefly God is provoked to remove our Candlestick, for neglect of Church censures upon scandalous offenders: A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump, 1 Cor. 5. 6.*

Answ.

I deny that the way defended hath any thing of the Church censures in it according to that text, for Mr. *Saunders* saith, they excommunicate none, and Excommunication (alone) is meant by this Scripture. The Apostle doth not say, Separate the meal from the leaven, but purge out the leaven from the meal, he doth not say, exclude the scandalous from the Sacrament, but put out from among your selves such wicked persons: that is, out of all Christian Communion, civill or sacred. What is their course to this Text, when they Juridically censure none, nor indeed are in a capacity so to doe? Casting out of the Church, and leaving out from the Sacrament those that are within, are huge different things; the first is lawful and according to Gospel rule, the other unlawful, as being against all Gospel rules or precedents. It's true, the neglect of Church censures where a Church is in such a capacity, is a great evill, that doth much provoke the Lord to punish such neglect, and that we are in
this

this capacity at present, some have more to answer for, then I fear they are sensible of, nor humbled under that direful guilt; my prayer to God is to make us all sensible of our malady, and in his due time restore unto this poor rent and divided Church that remedy of holy discipline.

His second evil is, *The confusion of souls by ordinary and common profanation; eating and drinking their own damnation.*

This is high indeed for words, but hath not that dreadful doome in it as he reports without better proof: ordinary and common profanation in the Scripture sense was never read of. The Church of *Corinth* lay under the guilt of high profanation, but it was not ordinary or common I think. 'Tis probable they never offended so again, nor any other Church: what their sin was should be enquired after more strictly, and the punishment inflicted, and then judge whether the Sacrament be, for the confusion of souls; it was a temporal chastisement to prevent the damnation of souls. This to the punishment: The sin was a sacrilegious misuse of holy things to carnal and common ends in the very act of administration, which I have largely given my thoughts of, and shewed that not any Congregations in our Church did ever or rarely so offend; and what he meanes by common profanation, must be some other thing, that the Scripture no where condemns,
other-

Ans.

otherwise then in every other Ordinance of God, that is too carelesly performed. As all other Ordinances, so this was instituted for the spiritual good of the Church; Christ commands nothing for the hurt of his visible subjects, they conforming thereunto according to their present capacity: the Lord gives his laws and Ordinances for our good only: Sometimes he permits a people for their punishment to chuse Ordinances and statutes of their own making for their hurt, as *Israel* of old did. I conclude then, that this evil, the confusion of souls, &c. is a slander of Gods Ordinance, and an evill of mens own making, when applied to the Sacrament, more then to all other Ordinances in the Church.

—Next,

He saith, in his third place, *Abuse of the bloud of Christ by being too prodigal hereof.*

Ans.

1. They properly abuse the signs of Christs bloud, that slight Sacraments as too mean and carnal to use to that end they were instituted for.

2. They who admit Heathens and give the holy Supper to persons unbaptized, or excommunicate, or to those that come on purpose to abuse the signs to common ends. But to administer the Sacrament unto serious professing Christians that come reverently, and demean themselves orderly according to the external part of this observance, is that which is according unto Gospel rule, and
the

the administration holy and warrantable; Christ that gave himself for his Church, doth not think much of giving the signs and representations of himself, body and blood to the members thereof. And who will plead for any but Church-members, who are under the obligation of this observance of their Lord? And to deny it to such, is to be more withholding then is meet, and a dishonour to Jesus Christ, who came into the world to save sinners.

His fourth is, *Obstruēding the reformation of the Churches we live in.*

And what is reformation in the Church, but to draw on the whole to a conformity to all the Laws of Jesus Christ, externally at least? For the Church can goe no further; it is the only work of God to reform the hearts of men. And the whole Church are as much bound to a conformity to this law of receiving the Sacrament in remembrance of Christ, as to any other act of obedience in the Church. He that commands all the rest of obedience, commands this too: And therefore they understand not what Reformation is, that are busie in such reformings in their Churches, that the greatest part of Christs subjects are out of carlesse neglection and exempted from their duty of obedience; Nay those that would serve their redeeming Lord and Saviour in the command of his own worship, as they are believing. Chri-

Ans.

Christians, in hope of his mercy and blessing to their souls, are discouraged and hindered by these pretenders to reform: They shut up the Kingdome of Heaven against poor souls, that as sinners would be entering in and adhering to their Saviour. They forbid whom Christ commands to serve him in this Ordinance, and in reforming of their Churches they make void the commands of Christ by their own traditions, which wayes tend more to the destruction and confusion of Churches then in the least the reforming of them.

Ans. His fifth is, *Crossing the desire of the godly in the land, and the actions of the State herein.*

The desires of the godly were, and still are for the reformation of the whole, according to the Word of God, and when they see evident demonstrations from the Word to justify a more general admission to the Lords Supper then upon mistake have been thought of; they will be satisfied in their desires, accounting those desires irregular that have bin drawn out without Scripture ground. Better such desires should be crossed then attained.

Ans. His sixth, *Degenerating from the Primitive times, and all true antiquity.*

That the Virgin Primitive times in the Apostolical Churches admitted all to the holy Supper that came under baptism, and were received into the Church, is so evident, that no sober man will deny,

as hath been shewed already ; and for after times , if they acted otherwise, they are as much to be questioned for swerving from the first precedents, as we.

As for that Antiquity that is newer then the Scriptures, this Author is no adorer of it, as himself writeth : *The Fathers were divided in truth, and united in error. The principle of Antiquity yeelds but a popular and fallacious argument*, pag. 6. 9. and therefore he might have spared this quotation of *Chrysostom* in his *Homily* 83. *Let us keep away all without exception, that we see to come unworthily.* But what he meant by unworthily whocan tell ? and what he meant by keeping away ; whether as a single Minister, or by the Churches Jurisdiction, is a query. But did ever *Chrysostome* forsake his Church as Pastor, and joyn himself as an Officer or member to another Pastor and Church ? And in stead of administering the holy Supper to his own Congregation, or using any acts of discipline to amend them, leave them out ? and separate some few with him to receive the Sacrament in another Church ? See whether *Christ* or his *Apostles*, or *Chrysostome*, will justifie your own practice ; all that you have yet pretended from the Scripture, to warrant your way, hath been sufficiently examined and confuted.

His last, *The want of making some separation, as to the Lords Table*, hath given occasion to
some

some to forsake our Congregations. Master Cotton, Bloody Tenent.

1. The want of right and solid principles, as touching the constitution and first reforming of our Church, hath given the occasion of the Brownists separation from us, for they in *New England* doe not scruple the administering of the Sacrament to a scandalous member tolerated by the Church, till censured Juridically: and for them that own our Church and Ordinances for true, they might be rationally satisfied upon the same principle.

2. The want of right principles, as to the Sacrament, hath wryed more of the godly minded then otherwayes would be; as men come to embrace truer principles, and conceptions of this holy Ordinance, according to the Scriptures; they will be more tender of making unnecessary separations and rents in the Church.

3. It is a wonder that our common principles in order to the Sacrament, doe not hurry all knowing conscilious men into some separations or other, sith it's said the unregenerate are far from being disciples, believers; and the Sacrament is a cup of poyson, and for the confusion and damnation of such souls; they are guilty of the murder of Christ, &c. And that they have nothing to doe with the Covenant; and therefore the Sacrament is but a seal to a blanck when administered

ministred unto them ; These erroneous principles doe more distract and trouble the poor Church, then men are willing to understand; or decline the unnecessary stirs that follow thereupon.

His second motive contains, *The great advantages got by acting in some courses of discipline.* But he should have told us, what courses of discipline he means, whether any course that men can invent? or that which the Scriptures only teach? What shall we think of that course themselves are acting in? Doth theirs (were it generally taken up) enable us *the better to defend the truth of our Churches*, as he tels us, pag. 162.

Must we run into a schism, and become like unto our adversaries in unchurching our Parochial Congregations? and gather or form up Churches out of them, as you; to defend the truth of our Churches? what is this but to yeeld the cause, and betray the Church, to defend the truth of a separate Congregation; and so to end the quarrel in becoming like unto our reproaching adversaries of Brownists and Anabaptists, &c. I doubt not but we shall finde friends to defend the truth of our Churches, as to their being, as they are formed up already and grafted into the true Olive, root and branch. And I think none are more perfidious to our Churches, then those that forsake their former station in the Church; and form a new with the

A a specious

specious pretences according to Gospel rule. What doth this imply, but that our Churches are false, and not according to Gospel rule? What (beside their own word) can free them from rigid and absolute separation? That which follows; *We shall have the better satisfaction in our Consciences, (whilest God is our witnesse that we have taken pains, drawn losse upon our estates, stirred up the enmy of the multitude for his service sake.)*

Answ.

And who hath required this at your hands? Where is it written that you should act as you do? If you meet with sufferings for your irregular actings, what thank have you? It's not the goodnesse of the men or ends, but the goodnesse of the cause that makes a Martyr, and brings solid comfort to the souls of Gods people; all sects are apt to blesse themselves in what they suffer by contrary mindes; but this and the rest that follows is but weak and beg'd too. I come to his answer of objections, pag. 164.

Object.

1. *The stirs and troubles where any such separation is made.*

2. *The separation defended is the same with schism, and absolute separation, pag. 165.*

His answer is, *We must follow peace with men, as it may stand with holynesse and no otherwise; and indeed from a high, rash or absolute separation there are dangerous consequences; but from that which is moderate and warrantable no such dangers, saith he.*

To

To this I reply,

1. That keeping the peace of the Church of Christ is more urged and prest home amongst Christians, then to other men in the world; Christ came to make division between the Church and the world: but left a legacy of love and peace to his Church only, they are to follow after the things that make for peace and the edification one of another without limitation: but holiness is the boundary of our peace with all other men of the world: there is an absolute injunction to the Church. *And have peace amongst your selves, 1 Thess. 5. 13. Mark. 9. 50.*

2. That to break the Churches peace by an unnecessary Separation is so far from holiness, or losing our blessing, that it's a wicked schism, as I have proved theirs to be; they not being able to warrant the separation they are acting in by any ground of Scriptures or principles of solid reason: And therefore it will reflect upon them to their reproach and shame, untill they be able to give satisfaction to the Church in their fuller defence, or reforming, by returning from the schism they have hatched and nourished to the great prejudice of many of their peoples souls. I come to his queries, pag. 166. I shall be very brief, and but touch at things, I having done more then was intended.

1. *Whether it be not against the Solemn Covenant, not to act in some disciplinary courses, for in*

A a 2

this

Query.

this we have sworn to endeavour Reformation in Discipline according to the Word. Hence he assumes when this was taken, either we saw the alteration of corrupt customs to be necessary in the Congregations we live in, or not necessary now; if the latter be true then whosoever so took it he swore not in judgment, and so took Gods name in vain for he swore to reform being convinced of no corruptions. But if the 1. be true, then we desire of every Minister and other man, that hath taken it, with what conscience they can oppose ways and courses tending to that sworn end, and how they dare to withhold their own activity therein?

Ans.

1. Without doubt it's against the Solemn National Covenant, not to endeavour in our several places and callings, the Reformation of Religion in the Kingdomes of England, and Ireland, in Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government according to the Word of God, and the example of the best reformed Churches; and likewise not to endeavour to bring the three Nations to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in Religion, confession of faith, form of Church Government, &c. But then the question is, What our endeavours should be as the case stands, as particular Ministers or private members? Reformation in Discipline being not yet agreed of by the whole what it is, nor in present exercise and force by vertue of law which was intended in the Covenant.

2. Whether the wayes and courses defended by our Author, doe not crosse and assault

saule the ends of the Covenant, as tending to nothing more then making divisions and several factions & confusions in the Churches of God, which have swore to bring the whole Church of the three Nations to the neerest conjunction & uniformity in Religion, confession of Faith, form of Church-government, &c. That we and our posterity after us, may as Brethren live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to dwell in the midst of us.

3. The Covenant binds us to reform in Discipline according to the Word, and example of best reformed Churches. Mr. Saunders puts in, and practiseth a more general latitude, *Whether not to ad (in some disciplinary wayes) and courses be not against the Covenant*; he means some courses or other of mens own inventing, as that of theirs which hath nothing of the particulars in the Covenant, in it, as being not grounded upon the Word (as I have made it manifest) not according to the example of best reformed Churches that have ever abhorred rents & schisms in the Church by unlawful separations, as their is, upon their own principles: for they separate from Churches they confesse to be true Churches; and the members thereof they own for believers, brethren, and within, in baptizing their children upon the account of federal holynesse. In stead of reforming their Churches, as formed of old by our first Reformers, they form up a new of the principal part of the old; leaving out of this frame the main mat-

ter of the old, so that upon the matter they pull down many Churches to build one, and rather destroy their Churches then reform them by holy Discipline. Discipline is to purge out some few to amend them; but theirs is to separate from the most of their Churches to destroy them, in not using the right means towards them as brethren to encourage them in all Christian obedience, &c. And hence with good conscience I fear not to oppose their way and course, without breach of my Covenant.

Nay in the 2. Article of the Covenant we are bound without respect of person to endeavour the extirpation of Superstition and Schism, as well as Popery, Prelacy, and Heresie. The two former may with good conscience be charged upon your way.

1. Superstition, because you urge upon all you admit, duties of necessity that God no where commands, binding the conscience where it is free, and so become Lords of mens faith: and unlesse Christs subjects will submit to these superstitious inventions, you have framed, you exclude them from necessary duties of homage and worship injoyed by their Lord.

2. Schism, because you are run into an unnecessary separation in the Church breaking the peace of the Church causelessly, as hath been hinted all along, It being the main I have writ, to discover your way Schismatical.

cal. But it seems he thinks that there was nothing corrupt in the Church to be reformed by Discipline, but admission so largely to the Sacrament, and that this was the only thing we swore to reform; and therefore must joyn with them, or else be forsworn, although they have nothing at all of true discipline in exercise: for they excommunicate none himself confesses. And it's clear as the Sun at mid day, that there is no other means to exclude Church-members from the Sacrament, but by casting them out of the Church Juridically, which is a question, whether any at present in our Church be in a capacity so to act; and hence the Covenant binds us to endeavour after such a capacity as to reform all corruptions that are properly reformatable by true Discipline.

3. He asks *What other way there is to be walked in to keep close to the Word.* *Query.*

I have given my thoughts in my answer to Mr. Ward. The Scripture rule examined; Mr. Joanes is considerable to answer this query, as the state stands with us at present. And if we were in possession of true discipline, we should endeavour so to exercise it, that the worst might be reformed by it, not refuse to admit them to the Sacrament, and so exclude them from all discipline, as if they were Heathens: and let not any assume the exercise of discipline, that are not sure of their warrant from the Word. And let them be sure they use no other censures then they have pre- *Ans.*

cept or precedent for from the word. And let them be sure they proceed to censures gradually, and for no other cause but for the like sins and scandals that the Word directs in.

Query.

4. *Whether the Church should own men to be members for a bare profession, &c.*

Ans.

I confesse I doe the more wonder at the query, because the most of sober Divines are taxt for unsoundnesse in holding the affirmative, and yet himself saith the children of such are holy federally, and therefore to be baptized, whereas if the parents be not Church members, how come their children to be holy federally, and to have right to baptism, that being spoken of the children of such that were in the Church? And if a remote right may serve to bring in the childe of such a bare professor, as he pag. 129. then why have not the parents of that childe the same remote right as being a generation nearer that right; they being not Excommunicate as is supposed? Is the child a member without so much as a bare profession, and the parents none that professe Christianity externally? A bare profession may be serious in its kinde I suppose, though it want *the will of holinesse*. So that if we adde to a historical or temporary professor, but to be serious and real in his profession for the present, he may passe for a member with him: and I shall think those men very uncharitable that judge lesse of ours, generally that frequent Gods Ordinances, and take themselves greatly

ly wronged, when they are deprived of any one, I take it to be a good sign that they are serious in what they professe, and then this is but the same (which in others) he conceives unsound.

2. What shall be done with the children of the most godly when they are grown up, if profession without true holynesse doth not continue such members, forasmuch that there is no rule left to dismember for ignorance or want of the work of true holynesse, regeneration, &c. members such, are, not only by birth, but formally by the Churches approbational act of baptism, they are so far from renouncing or forsaking their Christian profession, that they adhere to the external part of it, and are not scandalous: They neither fall off, nor are cut off by any rule, or act of censure; what hinders them, but that such remain members of the Church, and have a true right to all the external priviledges of membership?

3. If positive unbelief in denying the person and Ordinances of Christ, on whom the Church is built, cut off persons from the Church, as is clearly spoken of the *Jews*, *Rom. 11.* then the contrary to that Infidelity, which is a real owning and professing the person and Ordinances of Christ continues those that are members born, to be members so long as they hold to the Christian profession. Excommunication dismembers but conditionally

conditionally, for in case the offender externally reform, and hold to his profession, and promise amendment; he ought to be loosed from that censure. But I hasten.

Query 5. What shall Ministers doe while Government is unsettled, and their people opposite to wayes of Reformation?

1. Shall they give the Sacrament promiscuously to all?

2. Shall they by their own Antiquity exclude the unfit?

3. Or shall they wholly desist? To the last he answers, that the use of the Ordinance of the Supper is so necessary, as that it may not alwayes nor long be discontinued; the command of Christ (Doe this) requires obedience: this (he saith) is well proved by Mr. Joanea, but yet he doth not close with him in another point; namely, that while the Church is undisciplin'd, the Sacrament may be administred in every Congregation without any separation. But he conceived that the Lords Supper cannot be holily transacted by any unlesse the scandalous be removed, &c. pag. 169.

Ans.

1. It's a question whether their people are opposite to true reformation, or no; because they were never yet tryed with it; and therefore who can tell whether they will oppose it or no? That they are opposite to such wayes of Reformation as the Author pretends to, and labours to defend, is no great wonder; when Ministers will venture to speake, and doe such things to reform them
which

which are no where to be found in the Scriptures, but in their own wills and fancies, as I have discovered already, it's well he is so sober, as to hold the administering of the Lords Supper so necessary that it may not long be omitted, and that he assents to that Reverend Minister Mr. *Joanes*, (who hath done the Church most eminent service in that undertaking of his.) And then if it be a necessary duty requiring obedience, why then this may satisfie him in answer to his first, Shall they give the Sacrament to all? Yeato all that are concern'd in Christian obedience and observance, which all in your Parish that are baptized and of years are, as well to this, as to any other part of instituted worship in the Church. And there's no more danger in the word (promiscuous) to this Ordinance then to all others; there being as much to be said for the casting the scandalous out of the Church, as from the Sacrament, and more too; for we have no rule at all to exclude a scandalous member from the Sacrament while he is within, but we have clear rule to cast such out of the Church by Excommunication, and then removal from the Sacrament falls in as a consequence of that Juridical act, and no otherwise.

That Ministers are in a very great strait, by reason of the necessity of the one hand to administer (saith he) and yet perchance have a wicked party predominant to hinder any good course of separation.

Ans^r.

Ans. The strait is not so great *in re*, as in shew and conceit, men first receive false principles, and then conclude accordingly from them: and that brings them into straits, whereas if they were rightly informed of their own duties and their peoples privileges as Church-members, the case were easie. Christ commands to all his visible subjects, while they are within, is a sufficient warranty, & upon this very ground, you are now in no more strait about the Lords supper, then in all other worship which many scarce make so much as a scruple of. His saying, that this is against the mind of Christ, he intending it for disciples only, is pitiful weak, when himself grants, the baptizing of the children of all as holy federally from their parents, which cannot be true unless their parents be believers or disciples, as hath been shewed: and therefore in granting that, it doth necessarily prove the lawful right of all to the holy Supper, Baptism & Lords Supper being but the same seal of the same Covenant, in which both are included and concerned. And doubtlesse a single Minister is not impowered with authority to excommunicate Juridically, which I suppose he means is Mr. *Joanes* his advantage upon his adversaries, he holding them strictly to some such Presbyterian principles, as this; which I wonder that any man should dare to assume to doe as Mr. *Saunders* opens his minde in, and hath published it against the learned Assemblie, and all sober men; he saith, *Thus the Minister*

Minister by his own authority (without Elders) may put back such as he knows to be unfit. But if by his authority he may put back the unfit, then by the same authority he may as well Excommunicate; if by authority he means the authority of rule in acts of discipline; but if he only understand his Ministerial authority in a case of necessity, I think it not so insolent as the other, although it is a hard task to justify either from the rule or free themselves of doing evill that good may come, &c. And Mr. Saunders will finde work enough to justify their own way from Schism: he had not need entice others to as bad. But he saith further, the Minister is impowered and Commissioned as to all Ordinances by Christ, whether to this Sacrament, to act solely, or alone, is a question?
Answ. What should hinder, but that one alone may administer the Sacrament by vertue of that Ministerial power as well as in all other Ordinances of Worship? I know not Scripture that requires acts of discipline in order to the Lords Supper more then to the rest of worship in the Church. Those that can finde any such Scripture may do well to publish what they know.

6. He asketh who are fit to come to the Lords Table, and what qualifications may be justly required? And gives his answer.

Query.

1. *Concerning knowledge; he stands not so much upon the muchnesse as the soundnesse of it, save this,*

it

it must be so much as may let in Christ into the soul, &c.

Ans.

But he is not clear and distinct in prescribing the least measure of such a knowledge, that lets Christ into the souls of some persons; for it's supposed that some have Christ in their souls in their Infancy.

2. Christ first comes into a dark soul, that hath no other but a passive reception, and he alone brings true and saving light with him.

3. If no more knowledge be required to actual receiving of the Sacrament, then to a passive reception of Christ, where Christ pleaseth by his Spirit. First to take hold on souls, we may consent to this: but if he mean so much light and faith, whereby a man is capable actually to apply some further spiritual blessing by Christ, it requires proof; the bare sayings of men meely are not competent to weigh with the Churches peace and truth, so much concerned in this practice.

4. How weak is all that they can say in defence of this qualification to admission to the Lords Supper, when ours are all baptized (and within) and therefore under the actual observance of this duty as any other; himself saith well of a wicked mans praying thus.

Their presence at the duty can be no sin, while 'tis that they are commanded to doe: though as present their own evils make them unable to doe as they

they should, pag. 126. would men say but the same of this of the Sacrament, it's not sin to receive while 'tis that they are commanded to doe, though at present they through ignorance and other wants cannot receive as they should. I say would but men thus judge and say of the Sacrament, there being the same reason for it, as is proved clearly in another place : this controverſie would be ended, and all parties pleased. Besides there is not any law or rule in Scriptures to warrant the punishing of ignorance, or unregeneracie in the Church with the deprivation of a common priviledge belonging to members in common of the same kinde : never was such a thing heard of in the Apostolical Churches, that any were censured for ignorance in excluding them from the Lords Table, or from any other Ordinance in the Church. If you judge ours within, and baptized, and of years, and yet exclude them the Sacrament for want of knowledge : I dare be bold to say, that you venture to doe that which you have neither Scripture precept, nor counsel, nor precedent for : How you think to be born out in such a bold presumptuous practice against the clear command of Christ, you may doe well to consider of it. His quotations are so impertinent for his purpose, that it will be but losse of time and labour to examine them. I admire how men dare so notoriously

riously mis-apply the holy Scriptures!

2. As to practice he saith, *These four qualifications seeme necessary to admitting to the Sacrament.*

1. *They must be no companions of drunkards, or any other wicked livers.*

2. *They must be such as frequent and delight in the society of godly people.*

3. *Such as are not known to be guilty of any known sin.*

4. *Such as perform all religious duties, as well in private as in publick, &c.*

Ans.

1. That these are qualifications or duties required of all professing Christians, is granted. That receiving the Sacrament of the Lords Supper is so also, (it being a publick duty of worship incumbent upon all in the Church, and comprehended in his last) cannot be denied.

2. That these qualifications are necessary in order to Gods glory and our Salvation is confessed: but that they are necessary in order to receiving to the Sacrament (upon good grounds) is to be denied untill better proof.

3. These qualifications are necessary to prove our spiritual states by, and to know in what condition we stand in before the Lord. But the Scriptures quoted doe not in the least urge them as prerequisite unto the Lords Supper, more then to all other worship. They that have this Book, let them search

search and see if they can finde one of these sixty texts, that hath so much as a sound to prove any of these qualifications laid down, pag. 172. necessarily prerequisite in order to the Lords Supper. And if you cannot finde one of so great a number for his purpose, had it not been more for his reputation (as he is a Minister) not to have quoted them, then thus absurdly to misapply them to justify a way themselves have inconsiderately chosen? It's the usual road of those that have strong fancies and weak judgements to multiply texts of Scriptures impertinently. If this Author shall think it necessary still to defend their way, I much desire that he may shew himself a workman that need not be ashamed by dividing the pure truths of God aright: one clear and rational deduction from the holy Scripture properly applyed either for suspension or examination, or excluding the ignorant, would doe more to justify the separations that some venture to make amongst their people in order to the Sacrament, then multitude of texts impertinently alleadged, as hath been discovered. Nay it's a strange thing, and to be wondred at, that the same men that doe satisfie themselves, touching Infant Baptism, upon the Analogy of Circumcision, Covenant relation according to the state of the Jews Church, without any expresse rule in the

New Testament, in respect of precept or precedent. And yet the same men will except against the Analogy of the Passeeover, notwithstanding we have clear precept and precedent in the New to warrant the baptized of years to receive the Lords Supper. If the same men should be as exceptionous against the Analogy of Circumcision to Baptism, as of the Passeeover to the Lords Supper: they would utterly throw away the cause and run to the tents of our adversaries; both weak and worthless is that of Mr. Saunders in reply to Mr. Hunfy, upon the Analogy of the Passeeover, pag. 183. *The Passeeover had an external benefit which all did partake of, therefore it right to that Ordinance so far as external; but the Lords Supper is a more spiritual Ordinance, no type. The wicked were esteemed Gods people then, not so in the New. See Camero.*

Answ.

1. Doe not the Anabaptists say the same of Circumcision? it was more carnal then baptism, more typical, and annexed to external promises, and so would spoyl the Analogy; and may we not say of this Author, that his hath been sharpened at thein forge?

2. It concerns the Author to make good the first thing asserted, That all had an external benefit by it, more then what was eaten and drunk to the satisfying of nature, for all that came under the Law of the Passeeover

over were not in Egypt to partake of that benefit of preservation, when the first born of the Egyptians were slain. What think you of the generations that were then to come successively untill Christ? Nor were all the Egyptians smitten with that death, but the first born only. Besides, what external benefit were this to the Aliens and strangers that were Proselytes, and came under Circumcision? they were as much under the Law of the Paschever as the Israelites, and yet did not partake of that external benefit, and therefore that was not the thing that gave them right as he pretends. And whereas he saith, the Lords Supper is more spiritual, it is to be proved, the Paschever having the same Author appointing it for the same spiritual use and ends in the Church with the holy Supper. The external Ceremonial part of the one and of the other both alike carnal: and his granting, that both are the same for substance, as to the use and end, doth crosse and contradict this of his here; let it be proved that the unregenerate and wicked in the Church are not to be termed Gods people now. Doe not the Apostles give equal titles to all in the Church; calling them Saints, and such as were brethren and within, although scandalous and stubborn? and if the unregenerate and wicked in the Church, are not to be termed Gods
B b 2 people,

people, how are their children holy federally, that being affirmed only of the children of believers, which himself grants, which is crosse to *Carnero*. And the truth is, the arguments we urge from the Passeeover, Covenant relation, state of the *Jews Church*, Gospel precept, and precedents, the right of membership, the love of Christ to sinners, are so solid and full of strength, that all that oppose us will be asbamed at last.

There is no need of any further examining of what is writ by this Author in answer to *Mr. Humfry*, for had he consulted with what was written of late before his came out, he might have spared that part as unnecessary, he having but little that's new, considerable in the controversie. If the Author want work, let him answer *Mr. Humfrys* rejoynder, or the last part of my first Book not yet answered, or make good his own so clearly confuted, if he can: Or else return to the Church in feeding his own flock, and be quiet, endeavouring to heal the breach, which by an unnecessary separation he hath sinfully made in his Church.

I shal now take my leave of my Reader, and end with some Apologizing reasons, why I have appeared so stiff in opposing of these petty irregular reformings.

1. Because they have no foundation to stand upon from the Scriptures. 2. Be-

2. Because they hinder and obstruct the Reformation of the whole: Who will desire or endeavour after a uniformity of true discipline, if these private petty wayes will attain the end without it?

3. Because Suspension and Separation makes void Juridical Excommunication, the only separating Ordinance in the Church, and now upon the matter is wholly lost in Church.

4. Because these new contrivances tend to wicked division and schism in the Church, and a complying with that wilde Principle of tolerating every Sect and way, to the scandal of the whole.

5. Because these groundlesse partial reformings do make us insensible of our malady, and so carelesse of the right remedy.

6. Because this groundlesse pretended discipline runs private Ministers upon intruding the power of Jurisdiction, which as private Ministers they are not impowered with at all, untill the Church have chose and designed them unto Ecclesiastical rule and Jurisdiction: for all are not competent for that work, nor is it necessary that all should bear a share in the exercise of Church censures and policies.

I confesse I judge that not any Minister in the Church can justly assume an authoritative power of Jurisdiction in his Church by virtue of his Ordination and Induction.

And

And lastly, what Reformation can be rationally expected, when those that should be intrusted with the exercise of discipline, are wryed in their judgements about the censures of the Church, and in what cases to correct, and who should have the exercise thereof? Whether every Presbyter in general, or some peculiarly chosen, and set apart for Ecclesiastical rule and order only? What work would have been made in the Church by this, if the Presbyterian principles had been put into execution? We should have had but few Communicants in many of our Churches, had that rigid way of Examination and power in the Eldership to suspend upon pleasure gone on. When the Lord of his Church is pleased to blesse this poor distracted *English Church* with so great a blessing, as true and holy discipline is; he will both qualifie and furnish us with instruments fit for that work; in the mean time let us pray and wait, and use all good means we can to possesse so great a mercy, as may truly tend to the Reformation of the whole, without the hurt or prejudice of any part of Christs visible Church.

FINIS.

Books that are to be sold by Thomas Wil-
liams at the Bible in Little Britain.

A Chronicle of the Kings of England from
the Roman Government unto the reign
of King Charles; containing all passages of
Church and State, with all other observations
proper for a History: the second Edition en-
larged with notes and a large Table.

A compleat *Christian Dictionary* shewing
the Interpretation of the proper names, the
several significations, and several acceptations
of all the words in the Bible, with the addi-
tion of above four thousand words and phra-
ses, with a description of the properties of
Beasts, Fowls, Herbs, Trees, &c. A book
of great use unto Ministers, Masters of
families, all private Christians; the sixth Edi-
tion.

The Art of Distillations, with the choicest
preparations performed by way of Distilla-
tion, with a description of the best Furnaces
and vessels, used by ancient and modern Chy-
mists: also divers Spagerical Experiments
and Curiosities, the anatomy of gold and
silver, with their preparations and virtues;
the second Edition, to which is added the
London Distiller, shewing the way to draw all
sorts of Spirits and Strong waters.

The New Light of Alchymy, by Sandevogius,
with nine Books of Paracelsus of the nature
of things, with a Chymical Dictionary.

Glabers

Glaubers Philosophical Furnaces, or a New way of distilling in five parts, with the tincture of Gold, and Aurum Potabile, the first part of his Mineral work.

Spots discovery of Witchcraft, shewing the power of Witches, contracting with Devils, Spirits, or Familiars, and their power to kill, torment, and consume the bodies of Creatures; with the knavery of Conjurers, Inchanters, Figure-casters, Astrologers, the vanity of dreams, with all tricks of Jugling, and Legerdemain; and many other secrets.

Vade Mecum, A companion for a Chirurgion, shewing the use of every instrument belonging to a Chirurgion, with the cure of all green wounds, the vertue and quality of all medicines useful, with the way to make them; with directions for Crowners how to make Reports with a treatise of Bleeding.

A Vindication of Mr. Humphrys free Admission to the Sacrament, being an answer to Dr. Drakes Bar, done by John Timson.

way
of
of

the
ils,
to
of
rs,
he
g
r-
p
e
-
y
f